The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXVII OCTOBER, 1941 No. 3

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AT THE CLOSE OF THE SIXTH CENTURY *

FOR a thousand years Rome refused to acknowledge even the existence of international relations.[1] From the agreement with the Latins in 486 B. C. down to the end of the reign of Justinian in 565 A. D., she dealt with no nation as an equal and recognized none as her peer. The peoples with whom she came in contact were either bound by treaty, and then they were subordinate, or not bound by any tie, and then they were at war.[2] She offered them no middle course; they entered her territory as vassals or remained outside as enemies. Once she had annexed most of the ancient seats of Hellenistic culture, the distinction between Rome and non-Rome became synonymous with the distinction between civilization and barbarism. Just at this juncture in her history the Principate superseded the Republic. Under the inspiration of Augustus Rome became conscious of the exalted duty imposed by the position she had won among men. Hence-

* Paper read at the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, December 29, 1940, New York City.

[1] This paragraph hardly requires documentation since it merely restates a commonplace of Byzantine history; cf. Franz Dölger, "Die Kaiserurkunder der Byzantiner als Ausdruck ihrer politischen Anschauungen," *Historische Zeitschrift*, 159 (1939), 230-33. The ideal of the Ruler in the ancient absolutist states and particularly in Rome has elicited a great deal of attention lately especially from German writers; cf., e.g., the most recent study, Johannes A. Straub, *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike*, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte, 18 (Stuttgart, 1939).

[2] Mommsen-Marquardt-Humbert, *Manuel des antiquités romaines* (3rd ed., Paris, 1887), I, 286; VI², 207.

forth renouncing her past of idle conquest and brute exploitation, she dedicated herself to the noble task of educating mankind out of its petty rivalries and insularities into a vast community of one culture and one allegiance. So long did she dominate, so deep into the dim and mythical past went her remote origins, so firmly seated was her power, that, to the political thinkers of the early centuries, Rome was eternal, and the situation that she had created bodied forth for them the eternal order of the universe—a philosophy readily comprehensible to any one who recalls the shock of October, 1940, when the fall of Britain seemed imminent and the foundations of the earth shaken. To the theorists of that day, then, Rome was the world; her Emperor was God; her law was Providence. Beyond and around her roared the primitive Chaos, and her destiny it was in the course of an endless reign to subdue that outer wilderness, to impose organization, and impart culture. With the coming of Christianity this ideal did not die, rather was it baptized and transformed. The old Empire emerged from the font as the Christian World State, whose new and high mission was to preach the Gospel to every nation. The conquest of non-Rome by Rome now meant not only the victory of civilization over barbarism, but the triumph of Christianity over paganism, of the powers of light over the principle of darkness, of God over the devil and hell.

> "In olden times," writes Eusebius, the first political theologian,[3] "the world was divided into a great number of governments. This division came from the diversity of gods that were adored. But today the cross, the instrument of salvation and the trophy of victory, has been revealed to the world and has advanced against the demons. Instantly the work of the demons, that is, the false gods, has been scattered like the wind. One God is announced to all, one empire stands to receive and embrace all. Thus by the heavenly will two seeds have been cast upon the earth at the same time and have grown and covered the earth with their shadow, the Roman Empire and the Christian faith, destined to unite the entire human race in the bonds of an eternal concord. Already have the barbarians and the peoples on the farthest

[3] Straub, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-29; Hans Eger, "Kaiser und Kirche in der Geschichtstheologie Eusebs von Cäsarea," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 38 (1939), 97-115.

unknown shore heard the voice of truth. There its conquests shall not stop, but they shall extend even to the bounds of the earth."[4]

Thus history as Eusebius interprets it showed a continuous evolution. Mankind had risen from primitive chaos through ages of dissension to the perfect unity achieved by Constantine the Great. Henceforward the Empire and the Church were hand in hand to subdue all the earth to the peace of Christ in the reign of Christ. Thus Constantine and his successors would mirror the everlasting royalty of God, and the Christian World State would reproduce in this life the perfect harmony of the eternal kingdom of heaven.

That Rome never in the whole course of her history abdicated these lofty claims is the view universally accepted by modern scholarship.[5] Occasionally a writer such as K. Güterbock[6] or R. Helm[7] has maintained the opposite, but, as G. Ostrogorsky showed in his review of the latter's study,[8] Helm fails to prove this point. He does not distinguish between Rome's temporary acceptance of a situation and the permanent renunciation of sovereignty, especially over territory that she had at any time ruled. During the fourth and fifth centuries the barbarians swarmed across the Empire and created within it states to some extent independent. Rome was then too weak to assert her claim to world supremacy, but that she never dreamt of abandoning it is quite clear from the fact that, when Justinian found himself in a relatively stronger position than the intruders, he retook the occupied regions as his natural right. In other words, Rome perforce tolerated the existence of these nations but never acknowledged their right to independent existence.[9]

[4] *Laus C.* 16, pp. 248-50, ed. Heikel, quoted from Charles Diehl, *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au vi^e siècle* (Paris, 1901), p. 132; cf. Eger, *op. cit.*, pp. 111 f.

[5] Dölger, *Kaiserurkunde d. Byzant.*, pp. 231 f.

[6] *Byzanz und Persien in ihren diplomatisch-völkerrechtlichen Beziehungen im Zeitalter Justinians* (Berlin, 1906), p. 4.

[7] "Untersuchungen über den auswärtigen diplomatischen Verkehr des römischen Reiches im Zeitalter der Spätantike," *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, 12 (1932), 378.

[8] *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 36 (1936), 442 f.

[9] Diehl, *Justinien*, pp. 129-34.

The purpose of the present article, however, is to demonstrate that at the end of the sixth century Rome unequivocally recognized the right of Persia to exist as a sovereign and independent state on terms of equality with herself.[10] Persia was Rome's eternal foe. They fought interminably, not because of any real clash of interests, nor for annexation of territory, but because Persia had precisely the same pretensions to world authority as Rome itself. The Sassanid monarchs, looking upon themselves as the legitimate successors of the ancient Achaemenids, drew their inspiration from the mighty figures of Cyrus and Darius.[11] They moved in the vision of that moment when once again the ruler of Ctesiphon should be the earth's unique King, and once more the unchangeable laws of the Medes and Persians should govern every race from the banks of the Indus to the high Nubian plateau. Of necessity the two empires were implacable enemies, as irreconcilable as their political philosophies were uncompromising.

In the course of centuries this conflict of principle crystallized into a bitter quarrel over Rome's contributing to the maintenance of garrisons in the Caucasus. Through this range there are only two passes, one about midway between the Black and the Caspian Seas, the other at the eastern extremity. The occupation of these spots prevented the inroads of the wild barbarians living to the north and constituted the easiest and most economical method of safeguarding the provinces of Asia Minor from devastating raids. Consequently, Nero, when Armenia became his vassal, had readily agreed to subsidize the garrisoning of these points.[12] In the peace made in 363 after the death of Julian, Jovian ceded Armenia, and with it its dependencies south of the Caucasus, Iberia and Albania.

[10] Among the numerous sources for the period under discussion, 572-91 A. D., only Menander Protector and Theophylactus Simocatta have any importance for the subject of this article. They alone deal authoritatively with the official diplomatic relations. The present article touches upon political and military events only in so far as necessary to understand the diplomatic exchanges and aims.

[11] Güterbock, *Byzanz und Persien*, p. 2.

[12] J. Marquart, *Eranšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i*, Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, III, 2 (Berlin, 1901), 95 f.

Thus the passes came directly under the control of Persia, and Sapor II obtained the continuance of the payments, partly because as the new suzerain he claimed the right to all the previous privileges of the position, and partly because Rome derived as much benefit from the defense of the passes as Persia itself.[13] This was, of course, merely a pretext under which Rome pursued her normal policy of buying off barbarians when she was too busy otherwise or too weak to combat them. Subsequently she withdrew or paid the sums according to circumstances and always in the same supercilious spirit.

But the whole question assumed an altogether different significance at the beginning of the sixth century. Persia's push toward a place in the sun gathered impetus particularly in the reign of Kawad (488-531), who by weakening the power of the feudal nobility welded his country into a strongly centralized state.[14] After this achievement he demanded the renewal of the subsidy and, receiving a flat rejection, declared war in 502. The Emperor Anastasius took advantage of a truce to create two mighty fortresses on the frontier, Dara and Theodosiupolis, and this in defiance of previous pacts.[15] Finally after four years of hostilities he compromised in 506 by still denying the payments for the Caucasus but agreeing to an indemnity for the breach of treaty. This makes it evident that the amount of money in itself did not constitute the real issue; otherwise Anastasius would never have consented to giving it under any title. Further, his strengthening of the border indicates that he sensed something in the situation that spelled a new menace to Roman security.

So far as Kawad is concerned, it is not difficult to understand why he thought it worthwhile to fight over the comparatively insignificant sum. Characteristic of the Persians was an extreme national vanity. Firmly convinced of their superiority they sought always to have visible manifestation of it in their external relations. This trait appears constantly in their literature, inspires

[13] *Loc. cit.*; Ernst Stein, *Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches,* I (Vienna, 1928), 264.

[14] Arthur Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides* (Copenhagen, 1936), p. 347.

[15] E. W. Brooks, *Cambridge Medieval History,* I, 481-83.

the great epic of Firdausi, and meets the reader in their every word and action as recorded by Byzantine historians. Their great kings had to embody this conception, they had to dominate foreign powers in order to win any lasting prestige at home. In dealing with other countries they always kept in mind the reaction of their subjects and played to the gallery of patriotic self-esteem. Consequently they assume an insufferably haughty and lordly tone in victory and are merely patronizing in defeat. With the Empire they had no real quarrel, since its pretensions to exclusive authority in the world remained entirely theoretical. For almost a century and a half Rome had not made the slightest effort to exert her claim, nor even to win back the territory ceded by Jovian. She wished only peace and freedom from annoyance on her eastern boundary. This rendered her all the more tempting to ambitious sovereigns like Kawad, who had only to force from her some slight token of subordination to win unparalleled honor in his own land. If he had succeeded in extorting the subsidy for the Caucasus, he could have represented it as tangible proof of Persian ascendancy and it was enough to make him the great hero of his people.

The decisive factor in the politics of the sixth century was, however, the change in attitude of the Roman population. It is never to be forgotten that the theory of the Christian World State was not an artificial construction of statesmen or philosophers but the personal conviction of every Christian inhabitant of the Mediterranean lands, whether in or out of the Empire.[16] It simply put into words what each felt intimately in his own consciousness; it expressed his basic and fundamental political attitude. This is why, for instance, throughout this period the various groups within the Empire always crystallized their separatist sentiments in some religious but heretical formula. To us there is nothing unusual about adopting another country and surrendering citizenship in one's own, but to the man of the fourth or fifth century such a transfer of allegiance was inconceivable. There was only one country of which it was possible to be a citizen, only one authority to whom he could owe allegiance, and that was Rome. Outside of

[16] Dölger, *Kaiserurkunde*, pp. 232 f.

her, to his way of thinking, lay barbarism and anarchy. While he did realize his distinctive nationality, it never entered his mind to express it in political independence. To break his connection with Rome was to cast himself adrift without law, without duly constituted authority, without culture, without civilization. He solved the dilemma by ardent partisanship of a heresy; it became the badge of his nationality but did not sever his political affiliations. This psychology had undergone a profound transformation by the beginning of the sixth century. In the fourth century, Rome and non-Rome still remained equivalent terms for civilization and barbarism. In the sixth, when Justinian closed the pagan schools at Athens, the professors fled for refuge and patronage to the court of Ctesiphon.[17] Chosroes I obtained from Justinian permission for them to return safe home and to practise their religion unmolested until their death. This significant incident indicates unmistakably that the Empire had lost its position in public opinion as the unique center of culture. It marks the climax of the long process by which the East dominated the West in art and architecture and the genius of the Orient culminated in the greatest creation of the Occident, the Hagia Sophia. Furthermore, Rome and non-Rome had ceased to be synonyms for Christianity and paganism. The fourth-century Syriac writer Aphraates heartened his coreligionists with the conviction that Constantius would inevitably conquer the Persians; for it was in accordance with the divine design for the spread of the Gospel and the Empire.[18] But the sixth-century Syriac historian, John of Ephesus, has nothing but golden opinions for the broad and humane tolerance of Chosroes, however cautiously expressed.[19] Again, in the fourth century, the Christians suffered at the hands of Sapor II a persecution so unmercifully bloody and cruel as never even under Diocletian; but

[17] Diehl, *Justinien,* pp. 564 ff.

[18] J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'Empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide (224-632)* (2nd ed., Paris, 1904), pp. 47 f. Bibliothèque de l'enseignement de l'histoire ecclésiastique.

[19] John of Ephesus, *Historia ecclesiastica,* trans. by E. W. Brooks, Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium editum consilio Universitatis Catholicae Americae et Universitatis Catholicae Lovaniensis, Scrr. Syri, Ser. III, 3 (Louvain, 1936), 240-42; cf. *infra,* p. 301, n. 61.

in the sixth, Sebochthes, a Christian envoy of Chosroes at Constantinople, assured Justin II that Christians even in the farthest corners of Persia would fight to the death for their country.[20] In the sixth century, then, Persia stood side by side with Rome as a world power in popular estimation. The Sassanids had now succeeded each other for almost three hundred years and had all the prestige that goes with ancient lineage and long honor. Whereas the Chagan of the wild and uncivilized Avars, however great his victories, could not vie with the Emperor but always appeared merely a barbaric chieftain, rude and uncouth, Kawad with an immemorial and sacrosanct tradition of rule in his family, standing as the great representative of oriental culture, was regarded by the Romans on the same level with their own rulers.

This explains why Anastasius could not renew the subsidy for the garrisoning of the Caucasus, even though the sum was insignificant in itself and out of all proportion to the heavy costs of a four-year war. Previously, the Empire had never taken the threat of Persia too seriously, nor shown anything but disdain for her pretensions to world authority. But Anastasius divined the subtle shift of public opinion to a new respect for her and sensed in the situation an ever growing danger to Rome's security. Not content with strengthening his military defenses, he was resolved no longer either to pamper Persian vanity or build up the enemy's reputation.

In the treaty of 533, Justinian determined to settle the whole question with Chosroes I by giving him 11,000 pounds of gold (nearly four million dollars) as quittance of arrears and price of peace.[21] He took care, however, not to make an agreement for any fixed term of years, the ordinary practice, but "without limit," i. e., abrogable at the will of either party.[22] All impatience to

[20] Menander, *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum* (*FHG*), ed. by C. Müller (5 vols., Paris, 1841-83), IV, 239; also in *Excerpta de legationibus*, ed. by C. de Boor, *Excerpta historica iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta*, I (Berlin, 1903), 461.

[21] Güterbock, *Byzanz u. Persien*, pp. 43 f.; Diehl, *Cambridge Medieval History*, II, 29. Diehl has 110,000, which is a misprint.

[22] This is obviously the meaning of πέρας οὐκ ἔχουσα; "everlasting peace" is a misleading translation.

begin his reconquest of the West, he thought thus to keep his hand free in the East, calculating that he could dispose of the Gothic intruders handily and then teach a lesson to the Persian upstart. He repudiated Anastasius' policy entirely, but not just by yielding the very contributions that his predecessor had denied at the point of the sword. Characteristic of his exalted ideal of the imperial prerogative, he returned in thoroughgoing fashion to the traditional Roman attitude. He treated Chosroes with the same contemptuous indulgence that he had for the barbarian to whose cupidity he threw a sop, intending to crush him at his leisure. His plans miscarried and Chosroes made brilliant use of the opportunity. In 540 he seized the initiative and began a determined onslaught just at the moment when all available troops were needed in Italy and the East could not offer even nominal resistance.[23] In 541 he won his way through Lazica to bases on the Black Sea and conceived the bold design of putting a decisive finish to his agelong rival by a direct attack on Constantinople. In 545 he consented to a partial peace, dictating his own terms. At the price of four hundred pounds of gold per annum (about one hundred fifty thousand dollars) he granted a truce for five years, to extend, however, only to Syria, with hostilities continuing in Lazica. This was, of course, in keeping with his plans on Constantinople. Though apparently realizing his strategy, Justinian impotent in the face of his demands perforce acceded to them. This treaty lasted until 550, and after a year and a half was renewed in 551, Chosroes even insisting that Justinian pay pro rata for the eighteen-month interval.

Though the payments were always tendered for the joint defense of the Caucasus, yet the events of this decade made apparent their incompatibility with Rome's claim to world dominion. They were patently not voluntary contributions but forced levies, and Justinian was compelled to buy peace instead of commanding it. Whereas he had in 533 ignored the precedent set by Anastasius and assumed the stand of snubbing the pretentiousness of Persia, he now no longer dared to leave the treaty indefinite but must

[23] Güterbock, *Byzanz u. Persien*, pp. 42-54; Diehl, *Cambr. Med. Hist.*, II, 29 f.

make it for a fixed term at a regular rate. Even then far from purchasing safety for the Empire, he only furnished the enemy with a weapon aimed at its very life. Chosroes, already regarded by public opinion as his peer in every other respect, had proved himself his superior in war! As Procopius writes caustically of the second settlement of 551:

> These 2000 pounds of gold Isdigusnas [the Persian ambassador] wanted to take then and there but the Emperor wished to give instead 400 per annum in order to have some guarantee that Chosroes would not violate the truce. Later, however, he paid the lump sum in order not to appear to be paying annual tribute. For men are accustomed to be ashamed of shameful names, but not of shameful deeds. . . . The majority of the Romans were very indignant at this truce, though whether justly or unreasonably . . . I cannot say. They argued that this covenant gave the Persians undisturbed possession of Lazica for five years. The Romans could never in the future dislodge them while the Persians would have there a base from which easily to attack Constantinople. The ordinary citizen perceived this and got into a state of helpless rage about it. What the Persians had long desired vehemently, what they had never thought to obtain either by war or any other device, namely, to have the Romans paying tribute to them, this they had gained and more than gained under the guise of a truce. For Chosroes having assessed the Romans at an annual tribute of 400 pounds of gold (this was plainly what he had coveted from the first) had by now collected 4600 pounds of gold for eleven years and six months under pretence of granting a truce. Yet the truce made for tribute was such only in name since meantime he could make war in Lazica. From this the Romans had no hope for the future of ever freeing themselves but perceived that they had become palpably tributary to the Persians.[24]

At length, however, Justinian made a huge effort and succeeded in regaining most of Lazica. Chosroes, on the other hand, had grown weary of war and was preoccupied with the alarming expansion of Turkish power on his northern and eastern border.[25] Both sides, then, agreed to settle their differences in 561, Justinian again capitulating. Chosroes dictated terms practically identical with those of 545 and 551 though a trifle less degrading. He

[24] *De bellis,* VIII, 15, ed. by J. Haury (2 vols., Leipzig, 1905), II, 566-69.

[25] Diehl, *Cambr. Med. Hist.,* II, 30; Güterbock, *Byzanz u. Persien,* pp. 55 f.

forced his adversary once more to purchase peace for a set term of fifty years at 30,000 *nomismata* (somewhat more than 400 pounds of gold) the year, the first installment to be a lump sum for seven years in advance, the second for three, and annually thereafter, always, of course, as a joint contribution to garrisons in the Caucasus.[26] Further he would not evacuate Suania, a region essential to the defense of Lazica.[27] In other words, realizing that his lifetime would not see the downfall of Rome, he at least left an excellent vantage point for some more fortunate successor. The treaty represented a tremendous victory for Chosroes. During the negotiations the Persian ambassador conducted himself with insufferable arrogance, vaunting that Chosroes really deserved his official title "King of Kings" because he had since his accession subdued ten kings and forced ten nations to pay tribute.[28] Some years later when a Persian and a Roman envoy were both present at the court of the Chagan bidding for Turkish support, they fell into an altercation in his presence and the Persian boasted that "the Emperor was the slave of his nation and paid tribute like a slave."[29]

From this rapid survey of its history it is easy to understand why the subsidy to the Caucasus became the burning question between the two countries. It is perfectly true that the amount of money involved was comparatively insignificant and came to less than ½ of 1 per cent of Rome's annual budget.[30] But it furnished that precise point at which their irreconciliable political philosophies met and clashed. Rome asserted exclusive world dominion, regarded all aliens as little better than savages, and for untold years had been in possession. Persia took the same intolerant attitude toward any foreign power but had to struggle

[26] *Op. cit.*, pp. 61 f.

[27] Menander, *FHG*, IV, 220; *Exc. de leg.*, pp. 188 f.

[28] Menander, *FHG*, IV, 209 f.; *Exc. de leg.*, p. 177.

[29] John of Ephesus, VI, 23, p. 245, ed. by Brooks; cf. Menander, *FHG*, IV, 288; *Exc. de leg.*, p. 195. The latter does not state what the envoy said but it seems to be the same incident.

[30] Ernst Stein, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Reiches* (Stuttgart, 1919), p. 5. He concludes (*ibid.*, p. 159) that the budget of the Byzantine Empire did not reach eight million *solidi*.

through three grim and checkered centuries to win the highest throne. Once arrived, she could establish her claim only on the tangible evidence of tribute. Yielding it, Rome abdicated. This was the real issue.

An equally great stigma attached to another provision of the treaty of 561.[31] Herein both countries consented to bar all admittance to fugitives and to return them, if need be forcibly, to their proper allegiance. To some effects of this agreement no one could take exception, for instance, the restoration of runaway slaves, serfs, and criminals, whether political or otherwise. But time and again those who fled to the Empire for safety had been guilty of no other fault than their faith and had sought refuge from religious persecution in Rome as the avowed defender and champion of Christianity. As a matter of fact, the ordinary Roman, whether right or wrong, seems to have felt that it was principally against just such fugitives that the provision was directed.[32] In his eyes, Justinian by submitting to it proved false to his sacred office as protector and propagator of the teachings of Christ and betrayed the very substance and sanctity of the Christian World State.

These insults to the national honor were intolerable to a man like Justin II, who succeeded Justinian in 565 and shared his conception of the majesty and grandeur of the Empire.[33] His eyes were upon the glory of ancient Rome conquering the world. He was resolved to be himself the embodiment of the unyielding and stern Roman as his Empire was still to be the proud ruler of the earth. Determined to assert her supremacy he grasped avidly at the first occasion that presented itself. This was a religious revolt

[31] Güterbock, *Byzanz u. Persien,* pp. 95-99; Diehl, *Cambr. Med. Hist.,* II, 30. By a convention distinct from the treaty proper Justinian agreed that if the Christians of Persia were guaranteed full religious freedom they in turn would make no effort to convert the adherents of Zoroastrianism. It is difficult to determine the implications of this provision. It has no apparent influence on the subsequent events. Cf. *infra,* p. 314, n. 92.

[32] This attitude is nowhere explicitly stated in Menander, the only source, but is evident from the popularity of Justin's later repudiation of this provision. Cf. *infra,* p. 292, n. 39.

[33] Norman H. Baynes, *Cambr. Med. Hist.,* II, 264 f.

in Armenia.[34] The Persian governor had decided to build at Dvin a Zoroastrian fire-temple. As this contravened directly the treaty that guaranteed freedom of worship to Armenia,[35] the Catholicus objected strenuously and his protest being ignored summoned his countrymen to his support. Meantime they had already assured themselves of aid by a secret agreement with Justin II, who guaranteed that if they did not succeed he would at least offer them sanctuary. The Emperor was as good as his word. As Chosroes insisted that the fire-temple be erected, it came to open and bloody revolt and the final victory lay with the Persians. The ringleaders all fled to Roman territory. This provided Justin II with just the opportunity he desired to assert his right to protect Christianity everywhere irrespective of man-made boundaries. Not content with merely harboring the fugitives he invited them to his capital and received them with marks of signal honor while the whole city acclaimed his deed.

About the same time, in 572, another payment to Persia fell due.[36] Chosroes dispatched his envoy to collect it but gave him strict orders to pretend ignorance of the commotion in Armenia in the hope thus to prevent an open break.[37] The Persian king had already reached an advanced age, he had allowed his military machine to get rusty, and above all he recognized that if death should come to him while engaged in a desperate struggle with the traditional enemy, it might imperil the succession and throw Persia into anarchy. His ardent desire was to avoid war. When Sebochthes came to the palace Justin did not give him too warm a welcome. The special reason for this was that as soon as he came in to make the *adoratio,* as he bowed low the felt cap which he wore according to Persian custom fell to the floor. Taking this as a good omen the nobles and the throng excited the Emperor with

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 270 f.; Stein, *Stud.*, pp. 21-24. Other grievances between Rome and Persia contributed to the deterioration of relations between them but, as proved by Stein and as will be clear from the sequel, they had no decisive influence on the course of events.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 36, n. 21.

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 24 f.

[37] Menander, *FHG,* IV, 238 f.; *Exc. de leg.*, pp. 460-62.

the flattering promise that Persia was on the verge of succumbing to him. Justin was incited by these expectations and thrown off his mental balance to such an extent as to think that he would get everything he wanted without the least difficulty. When Sebochthes stated the object of his mission, Justin spurned him. "Friendship bought with money" he told him, "is bad, since it is base and servile and a market commodity. The definition of real friendship is one that is equally balanced and not mercenary, the firmness of which is fixed by nature." Flaunting his violation of the treaty he brought up the subject himself and asked whether the ambassador did not wish to discuss the condition of Armenia. To Sebochthes' mild answer that Chosroes had heard of a trifling disturbance to which a stop would be put soon, the Emperor said out in so many words that he had granted asylum to the fugitives and would not tolerate the injustice done them. He and they were members of the same faith. Sebochthes objected that Christians existed all over Persia who would defend her to the death, so Rome in championing Christianity would be attacking Christians.[38] Justin brusquely terminated the audience with the arrogant remark that if Chosroes dared move a finger (also means ⅞ in.), he himself would move an arm (twenty-four fingers) and invade Persia. "Be assured" were the words with which he closed the interview, "that if Chosroes starts war, I shall put him to death and personally appoint the next king of Persia."

This lively portrayal by Menander of the actual scene that precipitated the break brings out clearly the unbalanced passionate disposition of Justin and in his vulgar almost childish defiance of Chosroes the aggrieved pride from which sprang the war.[39] It is

[38] *Supra*, p. 286.

[39] This narrative provides an excellent criterion from which to judge the statements in the other sources about the motives for the war. The only cause assigned by Evagrius, *Hist. eccl.*, V, 7, by John of Biclar, *ad annum* 567, 2, p. 211, ed. Mommsen, and by Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.*, IV, 40, p. 174, ed. Arndt-Krusch, is the protection of the Armenians from persecution. For John of Ephesus, VI, 23, p. 244, ed. Brooks, and Theophanes of Byzantium, *FHG*, IV, 271, this is the principal though not the sole reason (cf. *supra*, p. 291, n. 34, and *infra*, p. 297, n. 50). However, John of Epiphania, *FHG*, IV, 274,

notable that the Emperor harps solely upon those features of the situation which affected Rome's world position. Even if the interference in Armenia had also political aspects [40] Justin adverts only to the injury that had been done Rome's prerogative as champion of Christianity. Clearly then the war had no other aim than the burning desire to vindicate the honor of Rome and heal her wounded prestige. The niceties of diplomacy would merely have obscured the real issue and Justin brushed them aside. His dramatic action rudely but unmistakably reasserted Rome's political, and especially her religious, world authority.

It was impossible for Chosroes not to accept this challenge. Justin's whole demeanor told more plainly than any words that he regarded his foe in exactly the same light as his predecessor had looked upon the Gothic kingdoms of the West—a trespasser to be bidden off the earth curtly at the owner's pleasure and convenience. For the first years of the struggle that broke out in 572 Chosroes

represents the shielding of the Armenians as more or less a pretext, the "real though hidden cause being the payments and Justin's determination not to have Rome forever tributary to Persia." In the light of Menander's vivid pen picture of the final interview, it is clear that the true cause of the war was psychological, the deep feeling of humiliation at the treaty of 561, and that Justin was determined to go to any length to wipe it out. Apparently, though, it was a matter of opinion whether the imposition of the tribute or the prohibition to protect Christianity was the more galling. John of Epiphania favors the former view and his statement means that the Emperor would not have been nearly so sensitive to the right of his coreligionists in Armenia if he did not have to make the payments. "Hidden cause" then signifies "subconscious, unrealized cause," not "cause generally unknown," or "cause not openly admitted," as neither Justin nor Tiberius makes any secret of his resentment at the tribute and John of Ephesus shows plainly, since he reflects the popular view, that its importance in occasioning the war was quite generally known (cf. infra, p. 297, n. 50). On the other hand, the preponderant emphasis in the other sources is on the religious side. This fact demonstrates that the vast majority of people resented the infringement of Rome's right to champion Christianity by the treaty of 561 much more bitterly than the imposition of the payments.

Among the sources, Theophylactus Simocatta, *Hist.*, III, 9, 6-11, holds a unique position; in language strongly condemnatory, he thinks that the Romans wanted war at all costs and were quite indifferent as to which of the grievances (all imaginary in his view) provoked it. For the explanation of this extraordinary stand, cf. *infra*, p. 310, n. 88.

[40] Stein, *Stud.*, pp. 21 f.

proved the master. In 573 he captured the great fortified city of Dara.[41] When, however, Tiberius took over the government as Justin's Caesar in 574, he turned the tables completely. Prosecuting the war with tremendous energy and efficiency he conquered all Armenia, Georgia, and Albania, and forced his antagonist to take the initiative in seeking peace.[42] The diplomatic missions met on the border in spring of 576. They devoted a full year to discussing who was originally responsible for the war, with, of course, no result whatever. This seems the height of futility but actually constituted an essential element in the studied policy of Tiberius, if properly understood.

His outlook is characterized by Baynes as essentially oriental, i. e., he recognized that the Hellenized provinces of the East were the real Empire and that, too weak and exhausted to hold the West, he had to renounce it for their preservation.[43] Stein rejects this view and proves that Tiberius wished, every whit as much as Justinian, to uphold the ancient Empire in all its integrity.[44] On the other hand, he admits, as everyone must admit, that Tiberius put the settlement with Persia above every other consideration and sacrificed both Italy and the Balkans. He explains this policy by the supposition that the Emperor regarded Armenia as an absolutely necessary reservoir of man power and resolved at whatever cost to annex it. This hypothesis unfortunately encounters so many difficulties that some other explanation has to be sought for Tiberius' concentration on the east.

Tiberius discerned as had Anastasius before him that Persian hostility was on another plane altogether from the harrassing of barbarians and differed from it in essence. The Germanic invaders, though coveting the rich and settled land, revered Rome as the sole source of law and civilization. Far from striving to unseat her, they regarded her as the mother of all authority and sought rather to win from her official recognition as sanction of their position and indispensable condition of legitimacy. But

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 46; Baynes, *Cambr. Med. Hist.*, II, 272.

[42] *Ibid.*, 274 f.; Stein, *Stud.*, pp. 68 f.

[43] *Cambr. Med. Hist.*, II, 273; cf. p. 276.

[44] *Stud.*, pp. 89, 117 ff.

Persia's enmity was malignant, aimed at the very principle of her existence and striving for her utter annihilation. The barbarians craved her goods; the Persians sought her life.

Again, the kingdoms that appeared on the Danube were ephemeral phenomena, rising like a thunder cloud on the horizon under the strong impetus of some exceptional ruler, but dissipated with his passing. These barbaric hordes, ever shifting and jostling and displacing each other, changed with almost every new generation. But Persia endured. She had now stood with a long line of kings of a single dynasty and under a stable form of government for 350 years and seemed as eternal as Rome herself. The contrast struck the people of the sixth century forcibly and provided the real ground for their insuperable aversion to the annual subsidies. "From this they despaired for the future of ever freeing themselves." "Justin determined not to have Rome forever tributary to the Persians."[45] The Emperors could hope by payments to stave off the attack of a barbarian chieftain for a few years until with the dissolution of his power the threat to the Empire and the consequent levies would cease. But the situation in the East was worlds apart. Here the payments were no temporary expedient to relieve a passing crisis; they were as permanent and galling as the enemy that exacted them was stable and arrogant. To be held up and mulcted by a border bandit was an outrage, it was not a dishonor; but to meet regularly a payment forced by an established power was simply to be reduced to the status of a province, "assessed" in the biting words of Procopius "at 400 pounds the year."[46]

The imperious logic of the situation then required that Rome deal with the permanent menace on her eastern border to the exclusion of every other consideration and Tiberius shaped his action accordingly. But he had first to convince Chosroes that the new policy was a fixed tenacious purpose and that no danger elsewhere, however alarming, could deflect it. Rome was immeasurably superior in wealth, population, and organization for war, and Chosroes had learned from his final defeat in Lazica that

[45] *Supra*, p. 288, and p. 292, n. 39.

[46] *Supra*, p. 288.

he could win only if his adversary attempted to repel attacks simultaneously on all her borders.[47] This explains why the two embassies frittered away an entire year in idle recriminations. Anxious as Chosroes was for peace, his interest was to prolong the deliberations to the utmost, as delay always worked in his favor. It gained time not only to recover from defeat but also for the pressure on the Empire from the barbarians to make itself felt and perhaps tip the scales in his favor. The Romans were well aware of this ruse of the Persians, but in this instance Tiberius let them have their way. He was absolutely determined to settle the eastern question but he had to bring home to the enemy that the previous basis of bargaining was gone forever. The hour of reckoning was at hand. If he had shown the slightest impatience he would have made himself a dupe of the traditional Persian policy of seizing upon the misfortunes of the Empire to wring advantages and prestige for herself. By his dogged persistence Tiberius finally convinced Chosroes at the end of 576 that he would deal with Persia exclusively on the basis of their mutual relationship with no heed to conditions elsewhere.

Tiberius had the genius to grasp that the very qualities which rendered Persia so formidable an enemy, her permanence and high culture, offered also the best foundation for Rome's security. Justinian had proceeded on the assumption that he could treat her like any barbarian. Justin II, stung by the ignominy of 561, thought only to vindicate Rome's honor by a violent assertion of sole supremacy. Tiberius with his keen and penetrating analysis saw clearly that the political face of the world had altered radically since the days of Constantine and that Rome no longer surveyed a universe without a rival. With farseeing statesmanship he set himself steadfastly to transforming that rival into a partner. To attempt this with a transient and irresponsible horde like the Avars was absurd; but to unite Rome and Persia in fast friendship, to link them in the joint mission to chasten and educate the barbarians beyond their respective borders, would not only create a stable situation on one frontier but would build a mighty bulwark

[47] Güterbock, *Byzanz u. Persien*, p. 54; Diehl, *Cambr. Med. Hist.*, II, 30. Cf. the statement of Hormisdas' envoy, *infra*, p. 306, n. 74.

there secured forever from attack. Such was Tiberius' inspired aim.[48]

Permanent peace on a basis of equal honor—the phrase is Menander's own[49]—this is the keynote of Tiberius' proposals to Chosroes. To the demand of Mebodes, the Persian ambassador, for a continuance of the subsidies, the Roman representatives replied that negotiations could not even begin until any such condition was abandoned. Any arrangement designed to hold the Romans forever to some sort of joint contribution and payment of tribute, whatever name it was given, could not in their view be called peace. Genuine peace, they said, was not something to be bought like a casual bargain at the market. Under such circumstances it could be neither permanent nor stable.[50]

The essence of the Emperor's policy is contained, however, in his settlement of the vexed Armenian question. At the moment his victorious armies occupied all Armenia and Iberia[51] and he agreed to evacuate both, again in the interest of a "steady hold on peace." To quote Menander: "[After Chosroes had withdrawn his demand for payments] everyone in the capital, senate and people alike, were elated and thought that their swords would now lie idle and they would have a really steady hold on peace,

[48] This is not stated in the sources for Tiberius but for Maurice, but their policy was one; cf. *infra*, p. 308.

[49] *FHG*, IV, 249, 250; *Exc. de leg.*, p. 465, 30, and p. 467, 3.

[50] *FHG*, IV, 249; *Exc. de leg.*, p. 465; John of Ephesus, II, 24, p. 63, ed. Brooks; VI, 12, pp. 232-34, ed. Brooks; VI, 21, pp. 241-43, ed. Brooks. The two writers give substantially the same account, with, however, an interesting difference of viewpoint. In Menander, Tiberius regards the payments as obstacles to permanent peace; in John of Ephesus, to honorable peace. The latter reflects the popular interpretation of the Emperor's attitude; if he could not make peace without disgrace he would not make it at all. Not that the former overlooks this feature, because it is precisely in this connection that he uses the important phrase quoted above; when Chosroes finally consented to surrender all claim to subsidies, he describes his capitulation as an agreement "to confirm the peace without money on a basis of equal honor." John of Ephesus uses exactly the same wording at times, e. g., p. 63, ed. Brooks, but on the whole he portrays the partisan admiration of the public for Tiberius as the worthy champion of Rome's cause. Menander, on the other hand, insists rather on the implications of his diplomacy.

[51] *Supra*, p. 294.

since in addition the Caesar was entirely ready to retire from Persarmenia and even Iberia. He understood thoroughly that once the Persians were deprived of so great a territory they would never surrender, not even if their power crumbled completely and became extinct.'' [52] The right of sanctuary for Christians, the immediate occasion for the war, offered no difficulty whatever. Justin II had sworn upon receiving the fugitives to free their fatherland from Persia, or, failing in this, '' never to surrender the instigators of the rebellion nor their relatives nor in fact any of their countrymen that wished to share Roman citizenship.'' [53] Tiberius maintained this to the letter and refused to make peace unless it was definitely understood that anyone either in Persarmenia or Iberia should have free access to the Roman Empire. Chosroes acceded to this demand readily enough, because it had no practical bearing whatever, as Menander expressly states: '' He realized perfectly that except for the very few who led the revolt, love of his native land which nature has seated and fixed in mankind would permit no one else to leave Persarmenia or Iberia for a strange country. Especially he anticipated that with the war stopped he would put affairs in Persarmenia and Iberia in proper order.''

To be understood these two proposals have to be considered as a unit. Both Baynes and Stein [54] see in the latter an agreement dealing only with the authors of the insurrection. But the wording is the widest possible, granting right of asylum to all dissatisfied subjects of Persia in Armenia or Iberia with no restriction of time: '' That in addition he would not ratify the peace on any other condition than that safe conduct be given to all the Persarmenians and Iberians who wished to leave their own land and move into Rome.'' The universality of the guarantee gives it a very special significance. As has been demonstrated above,[55] the Armenians' flight was seized upon by Justin II to avenge the injured rights of Rome as the Christian World State. He forced

[52] *FHG*, IV, 249; *Ex. de leg.*, pp. 465 f.

[53] *FHG*, IV, 250; *Exc. de leg.*, p. 466. Cf. Stein, *Stud.*, p. 24.

[54] *Cambr. Med. Hist.*, II, 274, and Stein, *Stud.*, p. 69.

[55] *Supra*, p. 291.

war as an assertion of the imperial prerogative to protect his coreligionists. The stipulation of 561 limiting it was thereby contravened and repudiated. If Tiberius repeated Justin's oath and upheld it as an indispensable condition of peace, it meant that he too required the abrogation of the clause as incomptaible with the honor of the Empire. Just as vigorously as his predecessor did he safeguard the religious dignity of his position. Anxious though he was for a final reconciliation, he refused to betray Rome's lofty mission to defend the faith and demanded the privilege of harboring those who were persecuted for it. Yet this could not have satisfied Chosroes and would in fact have been tantamount to nullifying the treaty, if it did not accompany some provision against a repetition of the very circumstances which had occasioned the war in the first place.

Religion was intermingled inextricably with politics in Armenia. The present revolt, for instance, had started from an interference with the rights of worship but had derived much of its strength from the dissatisfaction of the nobles with the financial administration.[56] The Christians had the bitterest hate for the fire-worshippers and especially for the priestly caste, bloodthirsty and intolerant enemies, and at the same time a proportionately close bond of sympathy with Rome. Of itself this rendered Persia's hold on the country precarious always. Tiberius would have been foolish to think that he could add the further incitement to revolt of immunity and sanctuary in the Empire and still be getting a "steady hold on peace," while by no stretch of the imagination could Chosroes be pleased—it is Menander's word—at such an arrangement. What Tiberius must have proposed, then, was to transfer the country to Persia irrevocably and to grant her a perpetual and clear title. The region had been repeatedly subject to Rome but she now renounced all claim on it whatever. Tiberius thus escaped the dilemma that either Rome's universal sovereignty over Christians had to be abdicated or Persia's right to independence denied. He asserted the former by guaranteeing a refuge to any Armenian who thought himself persecuted for his faith, and, to safeguard the latter, he gave assurance that he would

[56] Stein, *Stud.*, p. 21.

respect Persia's territorial integrity. On the other hand, Chosroes had pledged himself solemnly to tolerance of Christianity as a fixed policy and could be trusted to leave his subjects entirely free in its exercise if that liberty involved no weakening of his own power.[57] In short, to solve the Armenian problem, Tiberius dissociated religious lordship from political imperialism and claimed no more than the right exercised by any modern state to protect its own nationals. Once this difficulty was solved, Chosroes realized that he could restore order, and that no further trouble could arise because he had no intention of persecuting the Christians and Tiberius had none of using religion as a pretext for aggression.

Chosroes showed himself cordially ready to accept these conditions when Tiberius decided to seek the return of Dara in exchange for the evacuation of Armenia and Iberia.[58] He even offered to buy it back. The Persians were so delighted with the moderation of his terms that they consented to this also, and with the addition of little or no money. Suddenly they won a great victory in Armenia, which practically necessitated the reorganization of the Roman army in the Orient.[59] Chosroes' attitude veered completely around. He tried to bully the Romans into submission by threatening an immediate offensive in the East where the three-year truce had not yet expired.[60] Tiberius made a desperate effort to save the situation. In an extremely confidential conference known only to his trusted adviser Maurice, he offered to give any amount set by Chosroes, provided only that the whole transaction remain absolutely secret and Dara be restored ostensibly as a free gift. This too was rejected and hostilities resumed. The negotiations were not broken off but had to begin over again from the ground up.

[57] *Ibid.*

[58] *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 73. Menander, *FHG*, IV, 250 f.; *Exc. de leg.*, pp. 466-68.

[59] Stein, *Stud.*, pp. 69 and 71 f.

[60] In 575 a truce had been made for three years to extend to Syria only and not to Armenia, where all the fighting had taken place since. This truce had still a short time to run. Cf. Stein, *Stud.*, pp. 60-62, 72-74.

According to Menander,[61] Tiberius sought Dara:

> That in the future there could be no cause of war and certainly not for gain. For the only advantage of the city of Dara to the Romans is that it is very strongly fortified and the bulwark, as it were, of the Roman Orient. Partly, therefore, to give the Romans for the cession of so large a territory the consolation of having received back their own, and partly to leave not even a spark of war, he resolved to rescue Dara by money or in any other way. Now with regard to the need of making peace on a basis of equal honor the Persians had decided and agreed before the battle in Armenia. Moreover they were just on the verge of surrendering Dara for little or no money as soon as it became evident that the Romans had evacuated Persarmenia and Iberia. While they were in the midst of the discussion of this last point, news arrived of a great Persian victory in Armenia. . . . And, therefore, the barbarian was again bold and conceited and fairly strutted and threatened to attack before the expiration of the three-year truce.

As Menander is at pains to point out, Dara could not compare with Armenia in wealth, economic importance, or source of income to the State. It was valuable to the Romans only for the purpose for which it had been founded, namely, as an anchor in the front line of the *limes*. Jovian, in ceding Nisibis, put a tremendous fortress in Persian hands, but built no counterbalance to it on his own frontier. The Romans had, as a result, to make Constantina their principal base. Since this town lay about seventy miles from the border and Nisibis only eleven,[62] it meant

[61] *FHG*, IV, 250; *Exc. de leg.*, pp. 466 f.; John of Ephesus, VI, 12, p. 233, ed. Brooks; *ibid.* VI, 21, p. 243. John of Ephesus puts a different interpretation on the impasse over Dara altogether from Menander. According to him, Tiberius thought of Dara only because Chosroes proved so pliable on every point and Chosroes took umbrage at this. Thus came about the open break. The impression created by Chosroes on John, who was quite favorably disposed towards him, was that he earnestly desired peace and regretted bitterly the loss of property and life and the immense suffering occasioned by the war (cf. esp. pp. 241 f., ed. Brooks). Consequently he was very tolerant and sympathetic with a young and fiery prince like Tiberius, but he felt that the demand for Dara after he had been so gracious was an impossible imposition on his good nature. This is so obviously partisan and naïve as to require no further attention. Its real interest is the attitude of the Syriac citizen of Rome toward the Persian king.

[62] Ernst Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis*

that the Persians always had the advantage in the frequent plundering expeditions so characteristic of these wars. A very rich though limited region lay practically at their mercy. Furthermore, if the Romans wished to fight a pitched battle, they had to risk it at a relatively greater distance from their permanent headquarters. It was to correct this weakness that Anastasius had erected Dara. With Dara and Nisibis both in enemy hands, all the handicaps became more acute. Nevertheless, however much the circumstance might embarrass operations, it by no means constituted an insuperable barrier, and Dara's strategic importance must not be exaggerated. One needs no more proof of this than that Rome ultimately won the victory by an overwhelming margin, yet gained the decision by campaigns conducted exclusively from Constantina.

The city had thus a purely military value, and if permanent peace based upon mutual good understanding governed the relations between the two countries, it obviously made very little difference who held it. But here again, as with the subsidies and the right of sanctuary, international jealousy aggravated the problem. Ever since the fortress had been built in defiance of previous agreements, it had remained a sore spot with the Persians.[63] In all his treaties Chosroes exacted from Justinian that he should not make Dara his base, but Constantina.[64] Thus the incongruity of a huge stronghold, created at vast expense for no other purpose, with its arsenals empty, its granaries unstocked, its stout walls and bastions unmanned, stood as a reproof to Anastasius and the Romans for the breach of their word. In fact, only because of this very defenselessness had Chosroes ever been able to capture it. On the other hand, the Romans regarded the city as "their own."[65] The psychological implications of this statement of Menander's are striking. It shows that the Romans had grown so accustomed to

1071, Vol. III of A. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, Corpus Bruxellense historiae byzantinae, 3 (Brussels, 1935), p. 10. The distances were obtained from measurement on his Map I.

[63] Güterbock, *Byzanz u. Persien*, p. 44.

[64] *Loc. cit.*, and pp. 69 f.

[65] *Supra*, p. 301.

the situation created by Jovian's treaty that they looked upon their present frontier as stabilized. Subconsciously they thought of all territory left them by that settlement as " their own," and anything beyond as Persia's. The phrase brings home how completely the traditional imperialism had been abandoned in practice and how much public opinion took for granted Persia's autonomous existence. Consequently, if Chosroes retained Dara, the Romans would resent it as an undue encroachment upon their inherited possessions, especially since its alienation could be represented as a confession that they had done wrong in erecting it.

Therefore, it was in entire consistency with his aim, permanent peace on a basis of equal honor, that Tiberius sought to regain the city. He did not regard the situation as a very proximate occasion of trouble, though it certainly could develop into one of those constant irritants that made friendship between the two countries impossible. It was only a " spark of war," but it was a spark. He suggested the return of Dara largely as a gesture of good will from his new partner. Rome, victorious though she was, had given everything and Persia nothing. When the Emperor purposed to inaugurate a new era in their relations and substitute for the old petty jealousy and suspicion an alliance based on mutual confidence, then, if at any time, he had the right to hope for encouragement and reciprocity. He confined his proposition after all to something that would " give the Romans the consolation of having received back their own," and that benefited Persia in nothing more really than keeping it out of their possession. For fear that he might produce on his ever touchy neighbors the false impression that he was forcing his immediate advantage, he proffered further an equivalent in cash. The above interpretation of Tiberius' motives seems indisputable both from Chosroes' first spontaneous reaction and from the Emperor's subsequent secret efforts. The Persian king evidently appreciated the spirit of conciliation that prompted the request and responded in kind, agreeing without demur, demanding little or no money, and making his generous gesture towards peace, in the significant words of Menander, on a basis of equal honor. During the subsequent confidential negotiations, when Tiberius was doing every-

thing possible to save the treaty, he insisted above all on preserving appearances. The mere acquisition of Dara meant nothing to him; the gesture of cordiality and the illusion at least of hearty co-operation, everything.

But the news of the victory in Armenia brought Chosroes back to his old insolent self-assurance and the time-honored tactics. He had succeeded in his ruse of prolonging the treaty conversations until the tide turned. Pressing his immediate advantage he tried to throw the Romans into a panic and bully them into accepting terms that would again leave him in the ascendancy. Sweeping away at one stroke the whole of Tiberius' efforts towards a lasting peace founded on mutual respect, he resorted to every means, fair or foul, of emerging from the conflict with visible evidence of superiority. The only difference between his present proposals and the settlement of 561 with Justinian was that Dara superseded both tribute and denial of asylum as the palpable token of Persian preponderance. As excuse for his *volte-face,* he contended that he had acquired the city by legitimate conquest, while Armenia had been gained through treachery and breach of faith.[66] It needs no great stretch of the imagination to visualize the reaction of public opinion to such an attitude. The ordinary citizen would have acquiesced with an ill grace in the loss of Dara, which in his eyes belonged rightfully to Rome, even if he had received in exchange the blessings of permanent peace; but he could never endure its alienation if it was to be flaunted as a trophy of conquest and reproach for his country's perfidy.

Tiberius had no alternative but to continue the war. To yield at this point was simply to confirm his rivals in the fatal belief that, if only they held out long enough, the difficulties of Rome's position would give them the upper hand always and inevitably. To sacrifice self-respect meant a treaty with precisely the same defect as all previous arrangements, which were merely—and this was well understood by both parties—truces. Tiberius was unalterably resolved upon a fight to the finish, either equal honor or death.[67]

[66] Menander, *FHG,* IV, 250; *Exc. de leg.,* p. 467.

[67] According to Stein, *Stud.,* pp. 5, 73, 84, n. 12, 117 f., Tiberius together with

In autumn of 577, then, the negotiations were suspended and both sides once more appealed to arms. Through 578 the Romans dominated the situation and laid waste deep into enemy territory, capturing Singara and Aphumon with all of Arzanene.[68] Chosroes had even to flee precipitously from his summer residence. As a result, Tiberius in the following winter made another effort at peace, offering along with Persarmenia and Iberia his new conquests in exchange for Dara. Moreover, to show that his sentiments had not altered and that he still sought permanent friendship, he restored spontaneously a number of distinguished captives, some even of the blood royal. Chosroes would certainly have met his terms but his death intervened.[69]

This event brought into sharper relief the real issue between the two countries. His son and successor, Hormisdas IV, had an arrogant, autocratic, and violent disposition.[70] He scorned the time-honored diplomatic custom for the rulers of the respective realms to give formal notification of their accession, a ceremony observed even during war, and left no doubt as to his reason, that he regarded the Romans as beneath his notice.[71] He displayed

his successor Maurice had only one reason for continuing the war and that was to win Armenia as a recruiting ground. The willingness to surrender the country was only a ruse forced by the circumstances. The Roman defeat had been long prepared by the insubordination in the ranks and dissension among the high officers, and Stein supposes that this condition remained secret to all but the Emperor, who, realizing that the loss of Armenia was inevitable, determined to make capital of his private information by getting back Dara at least. His flank thus secured in Mesopotamia, the conquest of Armenia could begin again at a more convenient moment. This ingenious reconstruction is rendered unnecessary, however, by a closer study of the sources for the final outcome of the war, which did not come within the scope of Stein's work. Theophylactus Simocatta leaves no doubt that Maurice's aim, and consequently that of Tiberius, was peace on a basis of equality, an aim obviously irreconcilable with Stein's hypothesis.

[68] Stein, *Stud.*, pp. 74-76; Baynes, *Cambr. Med. Hist.*, II, 275.

[69] *Loc. cit.*; Stein, *Stud.*, pp. 89 f.

[70] *Ibid.*, pp. 90 f.; Baynes, *loc. cit.*

[71] For the custom, cf. R. Helm, "Untersuch. üb. d. auswärt. diplom. Verkehr . . . ," *Archiv f. Urkundenforschung*, 12 (1932), 388. Theophyl. Sim., III, 17, 1; John of Ephesus, VI, 22, p. 243, ed. Brooks, puts in his mouth the remark: "Why should I send gifts to slaves?"

the same overbearing attitude in the negotiations for peace, yielding nothing and demanding everything. He insisted upon payment of the annual subsidy and refused either to grant the right of sanctuary or to surrender Dara. He realized that these items had no intrinsic value. But Chosroes in winning them had attained the goal of Sassanid ambition, and they symbolized the culminating glory of 350 years of fierce uphill struggling. Hormisdas hated to forego the long result of his country's toil and sacrifice. "It was no disgrace," he observed, "for his father to give up what he had himself conquered, but it is a disgrace for a son to dissipate his paternal inheritance."[72] He was, in fact, the Persian counterpart of Justin II, an extreme nationalist, who recognized no middle course between crude assertion of dominance and complete humiliation. He could see but one course consistent with the honor of his country: uncompromising maintenance of supremacy. "What are the Romans so proud of," he asked, "that they demand the restoration of Dara? Wherein, pray, have they been superior to the Persians?" Such a question implied obviously that any concession was an admission of defeat and inferiority. The Romans were astonished at the rough repudiation of their moderate demands.[73] Menander expresses the quintessence of Tiberius' program in the words, ἐξ ἰσοτιμίας, 'on a basis of equal honor.' It was the ultimate gesture of conciliation, far more than the relative weakness of Persia entitled her to;[74] in the light of history, an unparalleled honor, and when her enemy scorned it, Rome had no choice but to fight on. So for the next twelve years, while his armies were annihilated and his territory subjected again and again to punishing raids and its inhabitants wasted with famine and the sword, Hormisdas refused obdurately to ratify the terms of the treaty until at length he was hurled from his throne and a usurper Bahram VI marched upon his

[72] Menander, *FHG*, IV, 257 f.; *Exc. de leg.*, p. 215.

[73] Menander, *FHG*, IV, 258; *Exc. de leg.*, p. 216.

[74] Hormisdas himself acknowledged the immense superiority of Rome in men and money but hoped against hope that her difficulties in Italy and the Balkans would ultimately force her to yield the point of honor. This is stated with cynical frankness by a Persian envoy; Menander, *FHG*, IV, 261; *Exc. de leg.*, pp. 217 f.

capital Ctesiphon.[75] It is a vivid commentary upon the autocratic, violent temper of Hormisdas and on the extreme nationalistic arrogance of his compatriots that they counted equality with Rome ignominy and died rather than acknowledge it.

Meanwhile in 582 Tiberius died and Maurice fell heir to his throne and policy. He too put the settlement of the Persian question above all others and carried on the same program, permanent peace ἐν ἴσῃ μοίρᾳ, as Theophylactus paraphrases Menander with a significant change of wording, 'on a basis of equal shares.'[76] The revolt of Bahram VI just referred to at last provided an opportunity for Roman diplomacy to achieve its ends. Chosroes II, after assassinating his father, ascended the throne but was attacked also by the usurper.[77] He had to flee for protection to Roman territory and by a strange irony claim asylum under the very privilege against which Hormisdas had fought so bitterly. Immediately upon his arrival he addressed a letter to Maurice pleading for aid and restoration to his throne.[78] The Emperor received him with open arms and promised to help enthusiastically.[79] But he met with the most obstinate resistance from a hardheaded and realistic senate.[80] They argued that it was to the obvious interest of Rome to let Persia fall into anarchy and be thus forever rid of the threat to her security. Moreover, Bahram had offered as the price of neutrality to restore all the territory lost to the Empire by the treaty of Jovian and they urged the acceptance of these

[75] J. B. Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene (395 A.D. to 800 A.D.)* (London, 1889), II, 105-10; Baynes, *Cambr. Med. Hist.*, II, 277-79.

[76] III, 17, 2; V, 15, 2.

[77] Baynes, *op. cit.*, p. 279 f.; Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 110-12; Martin J. Higgins, *The Persian War of the Emperor Maurice*, Catholic University of America Byzantine Studies, 1 (Washington, 1939), p. 26-30; 42-45.

[78] Theophyl. Sim., IV, 11, 1-11.

[79] Theophyl. Sim., IV, 12, 8; Evagrius, VI, 17.

[80] This is not mentioned at all by the Greek sources but only by the Oriental, e.g., Sebeos, *Histoire d'Héraclius*, tr. with notes by F. Macler (Paris, 1904), p. 15; cf. Higgins, *op. cit.*, p. 44, n. 17.

terms.[81] To this policy of extreme imperialism and aggression Maurice was unalterably opposed. In the face of hostile public opinion he determined to reject Bahram's tempting offer and restore Chosroes. The territorial settlement that he imposed was under the circumstances extraordinarily moderate, the only change from Tiberius' terms being the assertion of Roman preponderance in the larger portion of Persarmenia.[82] Naturally the payments ceased and Dara became Roman. In the remarkable self-control of these terms, Maurice showed himself the true follower of Tiberius' ideals. Maurice aimed, like him, at a permanent settlement of the eastern question and regarded the present situation as a God-sent opportunity to win lasting peace. This is precisely the reason he gave for accepting Chosroes' territorial terms rather than Bahram's; moderation in victory was the only hope of stability.[83]

That his policy was one with his predecessor's, the sources leave no doubt, as shown by the similarity of expression in Menander and Theophylactus, to which attention has been drawn above.[84] But, as previously stated, Rome's foreign relations were ever dominated by the ideal of the Christian World State,[85] and to treat with any other country on a basis of genuine equality implied the abdication of this position. As a matter of fact, Maurice in his treaty with Chosroes in 590 did renounce explicitly Rome's claim to exclusive authority over the world and he acknowledged to Persia an equal right to existence as a sovereign and autonomous nation.

This is first of all the basis on which Chosroes pleaded for his restoration. Directly upon taking sanctuary in Roman territory, he wrote as follows:

[81] Theophyl. Sim., IV, 14, 8, does not explicitly include Armenia in Bahram's offer, but the context implies it unmistakably; *ibid.* IV, 13, 25. For the treaty of Jovian, cf. *supra*, p. 282.

[82] Theophyl. Sim., IV, 13, 24. Sebeos, pp. 15, 27, gives the exact boundaries. Cf. Honigmann, *Ostgr. d. byz. Reiches*, pp. 28 f.

[83] Theophyl. Sim., IV, 13, 25.

[84] *Supra*, p. 307.

[85] *Supra*, p. 280.

> Even in the beginning the Divinity wrought as it were two eyes to shine on the world from above, the mighty kingdom of Rome and the prudent scepter of Persia. These are the great powers that winnow the unruly and warring peoples and that impart to the daily life of man complete culture and order. The condition of world affairs thus described has its logical consequences. Evil and mischievous demons roaming abroad in the world strive eagerly to overthrow the beautiful order established in the universe by God. If their effort is not to meet with success, the pious and godly who have received from God the treasury of wisdom and the arm and sword of justice must take the field against them. Bahram . . . wooing the throne for himself . . . has thrown all Persia into confusion. He attempts everything to quench one great eye of power. As a result, the uncivilized and marauding barbarians will gain a free hand against the civilized Persian State and later have unrestrained power to do great harm to Rome's own tributaries.[86]

The tenor of this letter is quite clear. Chosroes reminds Maurice that the highly organized Persian State on his eastern frontier provided a powerful bulwark against the barbarian hordes. Rome and Persia, therefore, have a strong interest in mutual preservation. Rome had herself acknowledged this by making the contributions to the joint defense of the Caucasus. But this co-operation implied a relationship which Chosroes draws to its farthest logical consequences, yet which no more than expressed how the two great states stood to each other in popular estimation at least throughout the East. Chosroes believes that both Empires are of divine right, designed by eternal Providence for the protection of civilization and foreseen in its plan as the two lights in the firmament.[87] It is against both nations that the enemies of God, the spirits of evil, lay their snares. Both are equally the champions of civilization against barbarism, the protectors of peace and culture against the warring and destructive hordes, the defenders of humanity against the aggression of the savage. In short, Chosroes pleads with Maurice on the basis that Persia is as much a part of the divine order in the universe as Rome itself and as essential to

[86] Theophyl. Sim. IV, 11, 1-11.

[87] This was an ancient, traditional, and thoroughly Zoroastrian figure; cf. Petr. Patr., *FHG*, IV, 188; *Exc. de leg.*, p. 393.

the fulfilment of the divine plan, the very basis of Rome's own claim to universal sovereignty.

Thus Chosroes proposed that each country modify its political philosophy sufficiently to admit the independent existence of the other. He suggested as the basis of stable relations the mutual recognition of their common mission to foster peace and civilization. We may feel sure that in this he merely echoes what his close advisers knew to be the sentiments of Tiberius and realized would make a deeply favorable impression on Maurice. In any event, this is the cause that induced the Emperor to make the astounding decision to save Rome's deadly foe from anarchy and ruin and build it up once more into a mighty power. In order to inform his readers of the motives for such extraordinary conduct, Theophylactus has recourse to the rhetorical device of the speech. Just before the final decree, a Persian ambassador convinces the Senate in an address that actually expresses Maurice's motives for his quixotic resolve. With his opening words the Persian envoy puts squarely the objection to the restoration of Chosroes: [88]

[88] That much of the speech is devoted to answering this objection is conclusive proof that Theophylactus intended the speech to be an integral part of his history, not a merely extrinsic adornment. Both Evagrius and Theophylactus (cf. *supra*, p. 307) leave the reader with the impression that Maurice received Chosroes with enthusiasm and proceeded immediately to restore him. Chosroes II, however, arrived at Circesium before March 7, 590, yet Maurice made his decision only a short time before January 7, 591 (cf. Higgins, *Persian War*, pp. 30, 42-45). Even then it was contingent upon Chosroes' winning considerable support in his own country, as is quite clear from the whole tone of the narrative (cf. Theophyl. Sim., V, 1, 6-8; 2, 2; 13, 4-6). The discrepancy between Maurice's hearty and ready promise and his tardy, hesitant execution would be very baffling to understand if the Oriental sources did not add the information about the opposition of the senate (cf. *supra*, p. 307). This clears up the whole difficulty. For some reason or other, which the present writer confesses he cannot fathom, the contemporary Greek historians took the utmost pains to conceal the conflict in the administration. Theophylactus, however, by inserting this whole speech to refute what the Oriental sources unanimously declare to have been the senate's logic, indirectly betrays his knowledge of the controversy, and, without mentioning it, gives the reader the justification for Maurice's conduct. The entire line of reasoning in the ambassador's supposed address must have been actually what motivated the Emperor. Furthermore, only this passage mentions the precise terms of the treaty (IV, 13, 24). Since Theophylactus never specifies them again it is even

> I am well aware of the objection that if Persia should be shorn of its might and sink into oblivion, Rome could batten in a peace created by the disappearance of its enemy. Such a view shows a poor knowledge of what will be to the interest of the Empire. It is impossible for any one monarchy to compass the boundless concern of the government of the world, to keep to its course with the rudder of a single mind the whole creation on which the sun looks down. The earth bears a character that is the antithesis of the supernal kingdom; it is forever steered into storms by man unstable of nature and corrupt of mind because of his tendency towards evil. The earth, then, can never win to the singleness of the divine and first leadership. If, therefore, Persia is bereft of its might, that might will instantly pass to another. . . . The Medes succeeded to the Babylonians and the Persians to the Medes. . . . Alexander the toy of fortune, who in her irony smiled on him for a brief space, . . . tried to extend by force his sway to wherever the air moves or the sun shines. He longed to enslave the world beneath a single ruler and a single judge. But his lust for power was extinguished with his life and conditions returned to their former state of partition into multiregal, to coin a word, rule. For never can homogeneity be engrafted on the disparate.[89]

Not the least remarkable feature of this very remarkable passage is the mention of Alexander the Great, the source from whom flowed all occidental ideas of exclusive world sovereignty. It shows the amazing hold of his superhuman figure on the imagination of even the sixth century and bears tribute to the strong historical sense of Maurice. The Emperor before his elevation to the purple and while still in command of the army in Syria conceived the grandiose design of marching directly on Ctesiphon and thus end-

more cogent proof that he intended the speech to be an integral part of the history. On the other hand, it certainly does not represent Theophylactus' own view. He wrote shortly after the final victory of Heraclius over Persia and before the Arab conquest (cf. V, 15, 6 f.). He had lived through the terrible years in which Chosroes II, with a cynical disregard of all his promises, had annexed the larger part of Roman Asia and even occupied Egypt. For him the name Persian was synonymous with treachery and deceit and Chosroes supreme in both (IV, 13, 1). So to Theophylactus the notion of treating Persia as an equal or of trusting any pledge from her seemed nothing short of fantastic. This is why he regards the whole war as absurd (*supra*, p. 292, n. 39). It was preposterous in his mind to look upon Persia as anything but barbarian and Justinian's policy of temporizing by payment of the subsidy was the only possible attitude.

[89] Theophyl. Sim., IV, 13, 6-13.

ing the Persian question for good.[90] The allusion here suggests that the great conqueror hovered ever present to his mind as he led his troops across the desert and down the Euphrates surveying regions not penetrated by a Roman army since the days of Julian. The expedition barely escaped disaster. Maurice's dream-castles came tumbling about his ears and brought him back to his good sense. It is a commonplace of history that the Mesopotamian Valley cannot be controlled unless the Iranian plateau that dominates it is also mastered. No Emperor, not even Trajan, dreamt of pushing the boundaries of Rome to the Hindu Kush and the Indus, yet that is precisely what a policy of aggressive imperialism in Mesopotamia necessarily implied. If such a conquest seemed chimerical to Rome at the height of her vigor it was an insane venture for the Empire at the end of the sixth century. All this forms the self-evident premise of the reasoning for the restoration of Chosroes. The merest allusion sufficed to remind any senator, silly enough to entertain the notion, that by incorporating in her domain the tremendous territory offered by Bahram Rome committed herself to a fantastic program of expansion ending no one knew where.

But the notion was not so silly if their only formidable foe disappeared swallowed up in anarchy, and, more particularly, if the immediate acquisitions would be secure from attack because the enemy was non-existent. To this Maurice might have answered, stressing the main point in Chosroes' letter, that the net result would only be to open up even farther flung borders to ever more numerous hordes of barbarians, but he did not. Instead, he rebutted that the argument was founded upon an illusion. The senators deceived themselves in thinking that the revolt of Bahram had ushered in a permanent reign of chaos. On the contrary, it was only a momentary commotion. Disorder might hold sway for a brief period but it could not endure. Inevitably in the past the East had come under a single rule and inevitably in the future it would coalesce into one empire. The ages had seen the Babylonians fall only to be succeeded by the Medes, and the Medes in

[90] Stein, *Stud.*, pp. 92 f.

turn made way for the Persians, and the Persians gave place, when the fated day dawned, to the Parthians. In other words, the East was a natural unit, one by the immutable laws governing the universe, and as such it would continue. The Sassanid dynasty might die, but the East would live on.

This premise, that the East was a natural unit, led by an inevitable logic to the revolutionary conclusion that the World State was not only an unattainable ideal, it was a contradiction in terms. Further, the allusion to Alexander is intended to hint at much more than the ridiculous lack of proportion between Rome's grandiose pretensions and her physical resources. Maurice emphasizes that he was unique in history, unprecedented and inimitable, the miraculous darling of fortune, a sport of nature flashing across the universe and swiftly gone. The very transitoriness, the very singularity of his feat shows the exception that proves the rule. His meteoric career, the breakup of his conquests immediately upon his death, typify and exemplify a political theory expressed by Theophylactus in terms that seem old-fashioned but that may be paraphrased as follows. It was Rome's age-old conviction that no one could build up a great empire at the point of the sword alone. For at the end the conqueror gazes out over random peoples collected within purely artificial boundaries, where heterogeneous nations jostle and institutions clash and a myriad babel of tongues confuses the ear; he rules not a community but chaos. A state, in the real sense of the word, must have some organic principle of life, some common ground upon which its varied nations, without merging their individuality nor renouncing their peculiar customs, may meet and find a basis for mutual intercourse and points of mutual agreement. But if the East has a natural unity, it has, therefore, a distinctive individuality, a soul all its own, disparate from the West and incompatible with it. East and West have each its own personality and temperament. Any attempt to unite them into a single system must necessarily prove ephemeral and abortive. Alexander had to fail. Rome, even if her resources were equal to subduing the world, even if she could duplicate the amazing luck of the great conqueror, could still never " win to the divine and first leadership." After all her efforts she would gain only an artificial unity lasting no longer

than the constraint that extrinsically imposed it, because East and West can never form a community. "Never can homogeneity be grafted upon the disparate." For Tiberius and Maurice this is in the very nature of things, the result of original sin and Adam's fall. Perfect harmony is for heaven; it cannot exist upon earth. They interpreted the design of God in the light of history and came to the conclusion that "He has given the earth a constitution the antithesis of the divine kingdom." In the first burst of exultation at the victory of Christianity Eusebius had written: "One God is announced to all, one Empire stands to receive and embrace all . . . destined to unite the entire human race in the bonds of an eternal concord."[91] With this ideal Maurice confronts the practical lesson of human experience: "It is impossible for any one monarchy to compass the boundless concern of the government of the world." This impossibility is founded on the will of God and is coeval with creation. Far from intending the earth to reproduce the eternal harmony of heaven, "the Divinity wrought two eyes as it were to shine on the world from above, the mighty kingdom of Rome and the prudent scepter of Persia." With unmistakable definiteness and explicitness Tiberius and Maurice thus renounced Rome's immemorial prerogative of exclusive dominion over the earth and proclaimed that after a millennium the World State had come to an end.[92]

Such is the theory at the root of what Menander called a treaty on a basis of equal honor and Theophylactus preferred to style a treaty on a basis of equal shares. Theophylactus' choice of phrase is illuminating.[93] Previous to 590, Rome claimed exclusive dominance of the earth; thenceforth she agreed to divide the world into

[91] *Supra*, p. 280.

[92] Rome's right over Christians outside her boundaries seems to have affected practically Armenia alone. At least so much is implied in the reason given for the changed status of the country, that it had occasioned the whole war; cf. Theophyl. Sim., IV, 13, 24. To the present writer, religion appears to have had the decisive influence on the relations between Rome and Persia. As no one, however, has made any study of the religious background of these wars, its role remains obscure. Our ignorance of this phase of the situation to a certain extent obscures also our understanding of the political relations.

[93] The only clue to the meaning of this expression peculiar to Theophylactus is found in the speech of the Persian envoy (*supra*, p. 309). This is further striking proof of its vital importance to his history.

two equal shares. She reserved the West for herself; the East she assigned to Persia. Her eternal enemy was to become her eternal friend, each with a distinctive outlook on life, each with a peculiar culture and civilization, yet both associated in a common mission to spread their blessings amongst the savages beyond their borders. In this noble alliance for an exalted cause, they would bury their insignificant quarrels forever, gaining a new strength and a new dignity in keeping with the honor to which God had destined them from eternity.

The enlightened author of this solution was Tiberius. Nature had gifted him with an insight amounting to clairvoyance, with a rare humanity and broad tolerance, enabling him to recognize the potentialities for good in the very factors that made Persia Rome's bitterest enemy. No wonder that Maurice fell completely under his spell; no wonder he adhered to his principles under circumstances the most paradoxical imaginable. To carry through a policy of permanent peace with an equal, he had practically to provide the equal; rather than abandon it he re-created Persia. The whole plan, unfortunately, foundered on the uncontrollable ambition of Chosroes II, who could not resist the temptation offered by the anarchy of Phocas' reign, smashed the treaty, and for a brief space ruled supreme in Asia. But his was a fatal error. He brought destruction upon himself and final irretrievable ruin on his country. He left Persia so exhausted by her endless, fierce, and tragically foolish rivalry with Rome that she fell an easy prey to the new and formidable Arab invader. The annihilation of Persia by this unsuspected barbarian enemy—the very peril against which the farseeing statesmanship of Tiberius would have protected her completely—provides the conspicuous justification of his policy. Persia, had she adopted his solution wholeheartedly, would have saved herself and together with Rome would have made a new epoch in world history. Despite its failure the whole conception was truly magnificent. Its inspired creator, Tiberius, emerges a towering figure not unworthy to stand beside the greatest personalities in the long annals of the Empire, and Rome herself, who for so many centuries had reigned majestic and solitary queen of the world, was perhaps never so majestic as in the moment when she graciously invited her envious rival to share her lofty position.

MARTIN J. HIGGINS

THE PAN-CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT *

THE Pan-Christian Movement is strictly a twentieth century endeavor peculiar to our own generation and time. It purports to bring about unity among the Christian Churches on a minimum basis of faith and order or life and work. The spirit of internationalism manifested among nations at the beginning of this century found its counterpart in the broadening of religious outlook in the various Protestant denominations. World-wide attempts at Christian reunion, known in Catholic circles as the Pan-Christian Movement, is the outward expression of this spirit.[1]

After the final separation of the Eastern Churches in the eleventh century and the formation of the Protestant Church in the sixteenth, many efforts were made to unite Christendom, as history clearly shows. We need only recall the intense activities for reunion of the Second Council of Lyons in 1274, and those of the Council of Florence in 1439, to which might be added the conversations of Spinoza, Molanus, Bossuet, and Leibnitz in the latter part of the seventeenth century, to prove that a sincere desire for Christian unity has always existed among Christians, although nothing came of these efforts since the obstacles to be overcome were practically insurmountable.

In our own day a renewed enthusiasm for Christian reunion is evident, as can be seen from the fact that not a few churchmen have dedicated their lives to this work. Some of them are drawn

* Paper read at the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, December 29, 1940.

[1] The following may be considered the basic documentary sources:

H. N. Bate, *Faith and Order, Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927* (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1928).

G. K. A. Bell, *The Stockholm Conference, 1925* (London: Oxford University Press, 1926).

Leonard Hodgson, *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order held at Edinburgh, August 3-18, 1937* (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1938).

J. H. Oldham, *The Oxford Conference* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1937.)

on by idealistic motives and urge all Christian Churches to unite in obedience to the precept of Christian charity, which commands us to love one another. The call for Christian unity comes from Christ Himself, they tell us, who prayed that " they all may be one." As long as Christians are separated and openly divided, these words will not be verified.

Others, influenced by the material advantages to be gained by reunion, advocate unity to prevent waste, overlapping, and a squandering of energy that have resulted from the division of the Churches. There are some, unfortunately, who strive to promote Church union especially of Protestant denominations for the purpose of taking a common stand against the Catholic Church. They contrast the weakness of a divided Protestantism with the strength of a united Roman Catholicism. This anti-Catholic attitude, which in all fairness it must be said is manifested by a comparative few, is gradually disappearing, although as recently as the Edinburgh Conference of Faith and Order of 1937, " an ecumenical church " was strongly urged by one delegate " over against the Church of Rome."

The most cogent reason, however, underlying the Pan-Christian Movement is the religious indifference resulting from the almost continual division and subdivision of Protestantism. Many Protestant leaders are convinced that only in the union of their forces can they hope to stave off an essentially pagan influence that is steadily encroaching upon traditional Christian doctrine. The scandal of sectarianism is especially detrimental in the mission field, where it retards conversion to Christianity. The World Missionary Conference of Edinburgh of 1910, which included the great majority of Protestant bodies engaged in missionary work, openly deplored this fact. In view of this chaotic situation the Pan-Christian Movement is not only encouraged but openly advocated by influential Protestant clergymen as the only practical solution for the manifold and perplexing problems that confront them in their respective churches.

Today in the Protestant world there are many universal organizations. Besides the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. with branches in practically every country of the globe, the best known

are the International Missionary Council, the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, and the World's Student Christian Federation. These movements, however, are not entirely universal in scope, since they are restricted to their particular sphere of action whether it be for united missionary activity, the promotion of world peace, or the federation of Protestant youth.

From the standpoint of the world Christian movement the International Missionary Council is the most important. It grew out of the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference of 1910, where one of the subjects discussed was the " Co-operation and the Promotion of Unity." The problem of church union in the mission field was further examined at another conference of the Council held at Jerusalem in 1928. The Council's latest effort to advance the cause of church unity in missionary countries was made at a third conference held in Madras, India, in 1938. These efforts produced nothing of a permanent nature concerning Christian unity outside of the establishment of one or the other federative union within restricted missionary territory.

The ultimate goal of the Pan-Christian Movement is to embrace all universal church organizations. Today, however, it is strictly identified with two great attempts at Christian unity, viz., the World Conference on Faith and Order, and the Universal Council for Life and Work. Before proceeding with the task of briefly outlining the development of these two movements, it is necessary to state their purpose and show the distinction between them. The latest tendency of amalgamating the forces of the two movements to bring about a World Council of Churches is anything but a natural development, for Faith and Order represents a trend toward unity entirely different from that of Life and Work.

The Faith and Order Movement, which has already held two universal conferences, that of Lausanne in 1927, and that of Edinburgh in 1937, is Anglican in origin, has been influenced greatly by Anglican doctrine, and to this day is still largely Anglican in character. Through a statement of fundamental agreements and disagreements of the various Churches both in doctrine and discipline, it hopes to achieve a minimum basis acceptable to all

Churches through which the ultimate organic unity of Christendom can be brought about. Only those Churches are invited to participate that profess belief in the Trinity and in the Divinity of Christ.

The Life and Work Movement, on the other hand, also represented by two universal conferences, the first at Stockholm in 1925, and the second at Oxford in 1937, had its origin in the Protestant Evangelical Church and is still Protestant in doctrine and sentiment. Without touching on doctrine or discipline it hopes to bring about co-operative action among the Churches on moral and social problems. In its ultimate analysis it is reducible to a world-wide Christian Church federation. No minimum of Christian belief is required for membership, so that even the Unitarian Churches take active part in the proceedings.

From this it can be clearly seen that the Pan-Christian Movement, whose aim is a united Christian Church, is more closely identified with Faith and Order and only in a wide sense can Life and Work be called Pan-Christian. The distinction between the two trends is indicated by Henry Smith Leiper in these words:

> This movement (Faith and Order) is quite different in nature from the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work. The latter, as its name implies, was created for united action in the practical application of Christianity in social situations; the former was created for the sole purpose of exploring the ways to organic union of the Churches. Despite the fact that both bodies derive their being and authority directly from the Churches, Life and Work has had a somewhat less distinctively ecclesiastical status from a technical point of view. It was designed to co-operative action in a definite field of work, while Faith and Order was established for debate on one special problem: theology and church government. One movement inevitably had a good deal of contact with the non-ecclesiastical world-governments, secular movements, international organizations, and cultural institutions such as colleges and bodies devoted to research in cognate fields; the other dealt exclusively with Churches through their official governments alone.[2]

The seed of Christian universalism, upon whose foundation Pan-Christianity in general rests, was planted by the Oxford Movement

[2] Henry Smith Leiper, *World Chaos or World Christianity* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1937), 166.

of 1833. Although there is no direct connection between this religious revival and the Christian world conferences of today, it gave to Protestantism its so-called Catholic sense, for up to this time Protestants were organized more or less on a national basis according to the principle, *cujus regio ejus religio*. From its inception the Oxford Movement was a reaction against such a nationalistic position. Through the *Tracts for the Times* it asserted that the Anglican Church was a legitimate and visible part of the primitive Catholic Church, rejecting on the one hand the Roman Church as corrupt, and on the other the Reformed Churches as perverted. In so far, then, that the Oxford Movement dealt a stunning blow to Protestant nationalism, it can rightly be called the forerunner of the Pan-Christian Movement.

Faith and Order can trace an even more direct relationship to the Oxford Movement, whose principles are upheld today in a twofold tendency: the one toward Rome begun by Cardinal Newman in his famous *Tract Ninety* and continued till recently through the efforts of that staunch Roman sympathizer, Lord Halifax; the other toward a sort of Catholic liberalism as advocated by the late Anglican bishop Gore. The first tendency culminated in the Conversations at Malines, while the other has become identified with the attempts of the Lambeth Conferences for the union of all Christian Churches. The Faith and Order Movement is the direct result of these conferences.

At first the aim of the Lambeth Conferences, which began in 1867, was not the promotion of union among all Christian Churches. They were convened rather with the express purpose of discussing certain practical questions pertinent to the Anglican Church such as, ways and means of supporting the missions, encouraging mutual communion among Anglican bishops, and other matters of a similar nature. Later the discussion turned to the problem of Pan-Anglican unity, as can be seen from the Second Conference of 1878 which examined, " the best mode of maintaining Union among the various Churches of the Anglican Communion."

A truly radical change took place in 1888 at the Third Conference, when a proposal was made to the effect that the time was

ripe for special action to promote Christian unity. At this conference the members declared themselves ready to begin friendly conversations with all who desired intercommunion, with the reservation, however, that they could in no wise relinquish their position on faith and discipline. The 1920 Lambeth Conference was by far the most important from the Pan-Christian viewpoint, because in its official declaration entitled, "The Appeal to All Christian People", proposals for Christian unity were embodied which have since become the groundwork for most union endeavors. It stated:

> We believe the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the wholehearted acceptance of:—
>
> The Holy Scriptures, as a record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called the Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief;
>
> The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, as expressing for all, the co-operative life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:
>
> A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.[3]

As an organized movement, Faith and Order began in the United States. At the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church held in Cincinnati in 1910, a committee was appointed to study the problem of reunion. It made the following report: "We believe that the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order." A deputation was accordingly sent to various Communions in many countries, so that by 1913 a number of Protestant Churches began discussing ways and means for the convoking of a Christian world conference. A preliminary meeting held at Geneva in 1920 was attended by representatives of seventy Churches. When the congress finally met on August 3-21, 1927,

[3] G. K. A. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity* (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), 3.

at Lausanne, nearly four hundred delegates were present officially representing almost every Christian denomination except the Catholic Church. Of the 116 Communions enrolled 14 were of the Eastern Church.

The subjects discussed were the following: The Call to Unity; The Church's Message to the World: the Gospel; The Nature of the Church; The Church's Common Confession of Faith; The Church's Ministry; The Sacraments; The Unity of Christendom and the Relation thereto of the Existing Churches. In the course of discussion some denominations made comprehensive reservations and exceptions, while the Eastern Orthodox Church emphatically stated that it could in no wise accept any report contrary to its doctrine, and therefore accepted only the report concerning the Gospel. The Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Reformed Churches of Europe added a clarification of their tenets, as did several persons in a private capacity.

At the close of the conference a continuation committee was appointed consisting of about one hundred members whose duty was to keep alive the work of the conference and to take whatever steps it thought necessary to advance the cause of Christian unity. It was particularly entrusted with the arrangements for a Second World Conference, which was held ten years later in 1937 on August 3-18 at Edinburgh, Scotland. According to the official statistics 414 delegates were present representing 122 Communions in 43 different countries. The influence of the Orthodox Church, which sent 21 delegates, was more strongly felt in this conference than in the first one.

Due to the peculiar conditions of Germany at the time, the German Evangelical Church was not officially represented. On the other hand, the official report indicated that four members of the Catholic Church attended the sessions but with no official status. The subjects discussed were: The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ; The Church of Christ and the Word of God; The Ministry and Sacraments; The Church's Unity in Life and Worship. Here as in the first Conference the Orthodox Church was forced to take a stand against the report and state clearly the Orthodox position. As far as Christian unity was concerned both

Lausanne and Edinburgh produced no appreciable results. At Edinburgh a committee was appointed to work hand in hand with the Universal Council of Life and Work for the establishment of a World Council of Churches with the hope of uniting all Christian universal societies for the purpose of eventually holding an Oecumenical Council of Christendom.

The Oxford Movement not only sowed the seed from which the Faith and Order Conferences sprang, but it was also the occasion, paradoxically as it may seem, for the rise of the Life and Work Movement among Protestants. In 1845 a number of ministers of the Evangelical persuasion sent invitations to all Evangelical Churches for a proposed conference to defend Protestantism against the incursions of the Catholic revival as represented by the Oxford Movement. The scope of this meeting was "to associate and concentrate the strength of an enlightened Protestantism against the encroachments of Popery and Puseyism and to promote the interests of Scriptural Christianity." In this way the Protestant Evangelical Alliance was formed, whose purpose, as expressed in its first conference held at London the following year, was "to confess the reality of the one Church, not to create it."

Another step in the development of the Life and Work Movement can be found in the formation of Protestant student societies for the promotion of social and religious life. At first only students belonging to the Protestant Evangelical Church were admitted as members, but gradually, especially through the efforts of Dr. John R. Mott, founder of the World's Student Christian Federation, those of other Christian denominations were permitted to join. Today the Student Federation, which formerly was composed of only five societies, has over 2600 youth organizations of practically every Christian belief, save the Catholic, on its roster.

The true forerunners of Life and Work, however, are the Church Federations established in many countries throughout the world. With the rise of church federation, the Evangelical Alliance began to decline, although in the beginning there was much similarity between the two in doctrine and method. With the formation of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in

America, completed in 1908, the church federation idea assumed world importance, for its scope was widened to include the association of all Christian Churches and to find ways and means for the bringing about of a united Christianity in social and moral problems. From its constitution its aims are declared to be the following:

> I—To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church.
> II—To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world.
> III—To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the Churches.
> IV—To secure a larger combined influence for the Churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social conditions of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.[4]

The Life and Work Movement, therefore, can trace its beginning directly to the Church federations, which at first were composed of various Protestant Evangelical denominations. Just as Anglicanism through the Lambeth Conference of 1888 opened its doors to all Christians for the promotion of Christian unity in matters of doctrine and church government, so too the Protestant Evangelical Church through the National Church Federation of America issued a call to non-Evangelical Churches to unite with them for Christian unity in practical matters of life and work.

Remote preparations for the first Conference of Life and Work were made in 1914 when, because of the World War, an appeal for peace and Christian fellowship was made through the Federal Council of Churches in America, the Primates of the Scandinavian countries, and others. Two years later at a meeting of the American Church Federation an oecumenical council was proposed for the restoration of the social life in Christ. Similar proposals were made at almost the same time by the Swiss Church Federation and in the following year by the Scandinavian Primates as well as by prominent members of the Dutch Church. Invitations were sent to all Christian Churches asking their co-operation.

[4] Gaius Jackson Slosser, *Christian Unity* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1929), 281.

In 1919 at the meeting of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches the following resolution was passed: "The Committee expresses its deep sympathy with the proposal for an Ecumenical Conference of the different Christian Communions to consider urgent practical tasks before the Church at this time and the possibilities of co-operation in testimony and action." Two other meetings of importance were held: the one at Geneva, where delegates from the Eastern Orthodox Church were also present; and the other at Hälsingborg, Sweden, which made definite arrangements as to the place and date of the Conference.

On August 19-30, 1925, at Stockholm, Sweden, the first Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work was finally held under the direction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Archbishop of Upsala, and the Reverend A. J. Brown of the American Presbyterian Church. The Conference was divided into four sections: The American, the British, the European, and the Eastern. About five hundred delegates from almost every Christian Church except the Catholic Church were in attendance, and, among them, seven representing the Eastern Church.

The following subjects were discussed: The Purpose of God for Humanity and the Duty of the Church; the Church and Economic and Industrial Problems; the Church and Moral and Social Problems; the Church and International Relations; the Church and Christian Education; Methods of Co-operation and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions. No official resolution was adopted other than the so-called "Message of the Conference", in which are recorded summarily remedies and solutions for the social and economic problems of our age. It is needless to say that no definite conclusions were reached concerning Christian unity.

Through the appointment of a continuation committee the Conference provided for the carrying on of the work. The title of the movement was changed to "The Universal Christian Council for Life and Work" and a research bureau was established. A few years later arrangements were made for another world conference because of the sad conditions in many countries and especially

because of the difficulties of the Church in Germany. At Fanø, Denmark, in 1934 the final arrangements were agreed upon and the subject of church, community, and state, was proposed as the most urgent problem demanding a solution.

At Oxford, England, the Second World Conference of Life and Work met on July 12-26, 1937. Over 425 delegates from 40 countries were present including a number of bishops and scholars from the Eastern Orthodox Church. The subjects discussed were: the Church and the Community; the Church and the State; the Economic Order; Education; the Universal Church and the Nations. Due to conditions in Germany the German Evangelical Church was not represented at the conference. As at the first conference, so also at Oxford delegates of the Unitarian Church were present. No results for the promotion of Christian unity were obtained other than the appointment of a committee to work in harmony with the Faith and Order Movement for the convoking of a Universal Council of the Churches, whose aim is thus described by Henry Smith Leiper:

> It contemplates a world council of churches functioning through a general assembly of approximately two hundred representatives appointed directly by the co-operating churches and meeting every five years. There would be also a central committee of approximately sixty members, likewise representative of the churches meeting annually as the executive of the general assembly. The council would have "no power to legislate for the churches or to commit them to action without their consent". Its function as provisionally defined, would include the following: "to carry on the work of the faith and order and the life and work movements; to make it easier for the churches to act together; to promote co-operation in studies; to promote the growth of oecumenical congresses in the churches; to call world conferences on specific subjects, as occasion requires". There would be two special commissions, one for the further study of faith and order subjects, the other for the study of life and work subjects.[5]

Through the proposed World Council of Churches, the Pan-Christian Movement has entered into its latest phase and has apparently succeeded in uniting Faith and Order with Life and Work in a last effort to bring about a united Christian Church. Only

[5] Leiper, *op. cit.*, 161.

too well does it realize, however, that without the Catholic Church it can never hope to perform its gigantic task. Accordingly, efforts have been made to interest the Catholic Church officially and otherwise in the movement but to no avail, for the principles upon which Pan-Christianity rests and the methods employed are diametrically opposed to the very essence of Catholic doctrine on Church unity.

The Catholic Church, on the other hand, has ever been solicitous for a united Christianity. Since the day that her erring children have strayed from the fold, she has worked unceasingly for their return, but she cannot permit the religion of Christ to be compromised. His Holiness, Pius XI, in his encyclical, *Mortalium Animos,* clearly brought this out when he said: "The mystical spouse of Christ in the course of centuries has never been contaminated nor ever shall be able to be contaminated, according to the beautiful words of Cyprian: 'The Spouse of Christ cannot be defiled; she is incorrupt and chaste. She knows only one house, she keeps with chaste honor the holiness of one room.'"

History attests to the fact that the Catholic Church even in our own time has made many attempts to reunite Christendom. One need only recall to mind the activities of Pius IX, Leo XIII, Benedict XV, and Pius XI. Their efforts were but the continuation of the work of other pontiffs who, unmindful of the injuries inflicted upon the Holy See, left no stone unturned to bring back our separated brethren into the fold of Christ.

When the Oxford Movement was at its height, Pius IX in the beginning of his pontificate wrote the encyclical, *Qui Pluribus,* inviting all Christians to return to the Church. Leo XIII in his encyclical, *Praeclara Gratulationis,* made a solemn appeal for the return of the Protestant denominations. "Suffer us," he wrote, "to invite you to that unity which has ever existed in the Catholic Church and can never fail." In the following year he addressed a letter *Ad Anglos Regnum Christi in Unitate Fidei Quaerentes.* Pius X, his successor, approved the observance of the Church Unity Octave held yearly from the feast of St. Peter's Chair to the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul.

It was during the pontificate of Benedict XV that the Church had direct contact with the Pan-Christian Movement. In 1914

Robert H. Gardiner, the secretary of the Faith and Order Movement, wrote a letter to his Eminence Cardinal Gasparri, in which he expressed the wish that " the Catholic Church which has always shown itself ready to help the cause of the reunion of Christendom, would benignly follow and ardently favor our endeavors." To this letter Cardinal Gasparri answered, promising prayers in the name of the Pope for the promotion of Christian unity, at the same time pointing out that the only way to true reunion was that of submission to the Vicar of Christ on earth. Two other letters were sent by Mr. Gardiner to which the Cardinal replied in a tenor similar to that of his first letter.

In May, 1919, Pope Benedict was forced to refuse a request made by members of the Faith and Order Movement that he send delegates to their conference. He declared at the time that the Catholic Church could not participate in these meetings, whose very premises were contrary to the Catholic doctrine of the visible unity of the Church. In the same year a decree was issued which prohibited Catholics from taking part in conferences organized by non-Catholics for the promotion of union among Christian bodies. Two documents already published in 1864 and 1865, condemning the unity movements of the time, were again made public, thereby demonstrating that the Catholic Church has not changed her attitude in the matter. A brief examination of these two documents will show the Catholic position clearly.

In 1857 a group of Anglicans founded the English Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity. When the English Catholic bishops noticed that Catholics were beginning to join, they thought it advisable to notify the Holy See. The Holy Office therefore sent a circular letter in 1864 to all the bishops of England forbidding Catholics to join or otherwise favor the association. A group of Anglican ministers together with a number of prominent laymen replied to Cardinal Patrizi, the Secretary of the Holy Office, declaring that Rome had not clearly understood the true aim of the association. The apparent sincerity of the signers of this letter and the respect with which it was written prompted a reply from the Cardinal himself in the following year wherein the true doctrine of Church unity was clearly stated.

In the decree of 1919, which forbade Catholics to participate in the Pan-Christian Movement, it was further declared that the instructions of the Holy Office of 1864 concerning Church unity were still in force. The same policy was followed by Pius XI who, though zealous for the union of Christendom, refused to compromise the true doctrine of Church unity founded upon the primacy of the Apostolic See. Another decree, which aimed directly at the Lausanne Conference, was promulgated in 1927. To the question proposed to the Holy Office on the occasion of the Conference, as to whether Catholics were allowed to join or otherwise favor congresses, meetings, councils, or societies of non-Catholics, having for their aim the association of all Christians into one federation, the answer was in the negative. It was also pointed out at this time that the decree issued by the Holy Office on July 4, 1919, was still binding.

Concerning the Life and Work Movement the Church had no direct relation save the following. To the letter sent to the Holy See by the bishops of Sweden gathered in convention at Upsala in 1918 to promote universal peace through Christian charity, Cardinal Gasparri replied in the name of the Pope that whatever would promote Christian charity in the cause of universal peace would be pleasing and acceptable to His Holiness, since he was convinced that civil society cannot enjoy a lasting peace unless the precept of fraternal charity be rightly observed. Therefore, whatever would promote or accomplish this, and especially in ending the world struggle that was going on at the time, would meet with his wholehearted approval, for it would also pave the way for the fulfillment of the words of the Gospel that there be but one fold and one shepherd.

Another attempt to interest the Catholic Church in the Life and Work Movement was made by the Lutheran Bishop Neander of Sweden, who, as a private individual was given an audience with His Holiness, Pius XI, during which he spoke of the Stockholm Conference. As far as we know nothing more was said than a repetition of what was already contained in the letters of Cardinal Gasparri to the promoters of the Faith and Order Movement. From this we must conclude that the decrees forbidding Catholic participation in Pan-Christian endeavors apply as much to the

Life and Work Movement as they do to the Faith and Order Movement.

Many Protestants considered these prohibitions and refusals on the part of the Holy See as precautionary measures rather than a statement of Catholic doctrine. To dispel this false idea and to decide the question once and for all, Pius XI in 1928 gave to the world the encyclical, *Mortalium Animos,* in which he stated in unmistakable words the Catholic position on Church unity, at the same time condemning the doctrine of Pan-Christianity. Because of the importance of this document and because it gives a comprehensive view of the teaching of the Church on Christian unity, a brief description will be most helpful.

Mortalium Animos is a great encyclical by a great Pope. It does not, as many non-Catholics will have us believe, definitely destroy the chances for Christian unity. The efforts of Pius XI for reunion are well enough known to show that this is not the case. If he appears austere and uncompromising in this encyclical, the reasons are obvious, for Pan-Christianity is opposed to the very essence of Catholic doctrine. The encyclical deals exclusively with the problem of Church unity, as can be seen from its title: "An Encyclical Letter on the Promotion of True Religious Unity." In the introduction, after an observation on the modern trend toward unity in all fields whether it be among nations for international peace, or among religions, Christian and non-Christian, for the settlement of social problems, he speaks of the tendency of Christians to unite, but on a false basis.

> But where the error is more easily concealed under the appearance of good is when it treats of promoting unity among all Christians. Is it not just, so they repeat, is it not even a duty that those who call upon the name of Christ should abstain from reciprocal recriminations and should bind themselves together with the bond of conquering charity? And who would dare to say that he love Jesus Christ if he does not work with all his forces to attain His desire, for He prayed the Father that His disciples would be "one only". . . . Would to heaven, they subjoin, that all Christians were "one"; they would be then stronger against the plague of impiety which, spreading more each day, threatens to overthrow the Gospel.

The body of the encyclical is directly concerned with Pan-Christianity, explaining its principles, refuting its contentions, and warning Catholics against its errors.

> Among them, in fact, a goodly number deny that the Church of Christ should be visible, that is, in the sense that it should appear as one only body of the faithful, agreeing in one only identical doctrine under one only head and teacher. But they understand by the Visible Church nothing more than a society formed by various Christian communities, although this may adhere to one, and that to the other doctrine, even if these doctrines are opposite. . . . Under such conditions it is clear that the Apostolic See can in no manner participate in their reunions and that in no possible manner are Catholics able to adhere to or furnish aid to such attempts; if they were to do so they would concede authority to a false Christian religion, thoroughly different from the Church of Christ.

His Holiness concludes with the prayer that our separated brethren will see the way of true unity and return to the fold of Christ in the Catholic Church.

> Therefore to the Apostolic See . . . let these dissident children return, not with the idea that " the Church of the living God, the column and prop of truth, will cast aside the integrity of the faith and tolerate their errors, but that they may submit to Her magistracy and rule ". . . . For this intention, without doubt most grave, We invoke and We desire that you invoke, the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of Divine Grace, conqueror of all heresies and Help of Christians, to the end that before long, that much desired day may dawn when all men shall hear the voice of the Divine Son, conserving the unity of the Spirit, mediating the bond of Peace.

With this pronouncement there was no longer any doubt in the minds of the promoters of the Pan-Christian Movement concerning the attitude of the Catholic Church, so that at the conferences of Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937 no official attempts were made to have the Catholic Church as such represented, although, as has already been seen, some Catholic observers were present but not in an official capacity. With these words of Pius XI the Pan-Christian Movement stands condemned in the eyes of the Catholic world. In unequivocal words, putting aside all sentimentalism, His Holiness clearly states that at all costs the Faith of Christ must be safeguarded. The unity of Christendom is to be desired, but it must be only the unity given by Christ to the Catholic Church, the unblemished unity which has been the Church's distinguishing mark from the beginning of her existence.

LEONARD BACIGALUPO

MISCELLANY

Philipp von Stosch: Collector, Bibliophile, Spy, Thief (1611–1757)

On November 6, 1757, Baron Philipp von Stosch died in Florence. He left a collection of carved gems and medals superior even to the famous one owned by the king of France, and a library of rare and beautiful manuscripts coveted by the pope. He was known to scholars and collectors all over Europe, many of whom had visited him in Florence and examined his treasures. His death caused a flurry of excitement among collectors, for his heir announced that everything would be sold. The collection of gems eventually came into the possession of Frederick the Great and are now in a Berlin museum. Curios and pieces of sculpture went to private purchasers, and some of the manuscripts were bought by the Vatican. Almost a century and a half after the baron's death, it was found that many of the manuscripts had been stolen from the Vatican itself, although they had not been missed in the interim, nor recognized as stolen goods in 1759 when they were bought back and recatalogued. The discovery of these thefts added a new chapter to the story of the remarkable life of Philipp von Stosch.[1]

Stosch was born in Küstrin, Brandenburg, in 1611, of an old Silesian family, whose title had not been claimed for several generations because of their poverty. His father, who was a doctor, educated him for the ministry, and sent him in 1706 to Frankfort-am-Oder to study theology. In 1709 he abandoned theology for archaeology and travel, and revived the family title, which he used successfully as a card of admission to rich and princely houses.[2] During sojourns in Holland and France, he made valuable acquaintances among scholars, who supplied him with letters of introduction to their friends.[3]

In 1710 he was taken in hand by his brother-in-law, Baron von Schmettau, Prussian ambassador at the Hague. Through him he met the *Greffier*

[1] C. Justi published a part of his correspondence in *Briefe des Barons Philipp von Stosch* (Marburg, 1871). He treated some phases of his life in "Philipp von Stosch und seine Zeit", *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst,* VII (1871), 293-308, 332-346; also in his *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1923).

[2] *Zeitschrift* . . . , VII, 295; *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie,* XXXVI (1893), 464-466.

[3] *Zeitschrift* . . . , VII, 296.

of Holland, Franz Fagel,[4] who, like Stosch, was interested in archeology and antiquities. Fagel was his first adviser in the realm of collecting, and it was he who gave Stosch the nucleus of his collection of ancient medals. To Fagel he likewise owed his initiation into politics, and to what may be politely termed diplomacy. Fagel used him on a number of secret missions, including one to England,[5] at a time when Holland was the channel through which passed agents and information concerning the Stuart Pretender. It was probably during this trip to England that Stosch made the acquaintance of the learned Richard Bentley, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, with whom he continued relations for some years.[6]

Baron von Schmettau had hopes of a diplomatic career for his young brother-in-law and arranged for him to accompany him to Italy in 1714.[7] Stosch went on alone to Rome in 1715 and struck out for himself,[8] with confidence in his scholarly reputation and his accumulation of learned friends. Dom Bernard de Montfaucon, the learned French Benedictine, introduced him to Giusto Fontanini, a papal chamberlain. Shortly thereafter he was presented to Clement XI, who gave him a pension and tried to convert him to Catholicism. The Pope remained his friend despite his persistent Protestantism, and when Stosch was called home two years later, he carried with him a papal gift of valuable books and introductions to the papal nuncios all over Europe.[9]

During his two years in Italy, Stosch had come to know many Italian scholars. In 1715 he was already writing to Matteo Egizio in Naples.[10] He knew Francesco Valetta, whose family possessed a magnificent library and a collection of vases believed to be the oldest in the world.[11] He had

[4] Franz Fagel (1659-1746) served as assistant to the *Greffier*, or secretary to the Estates-General of the Netherlands, and as *Greffier*, over a period of sixty-four years, retiring in 1744, two years before his death.

[5] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 296.

[6] Justi (*Zeitschrift* ..., VI, 295) says that Stosch spent six months with Bentley at Cambridge. Some of Bentley's correspondence indicates that a visit of unstated length took place. One letter, of June 21, 1712, shows that a warm friendship already existed at that time. Christopher Wordsworth, ed., *Correspondence of Richard Bentley* (2 vols., London, 1842), I, 432.

[7] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 296.

[8] In a letter to Matteo Egizio, dated July 13, 1715, Stosch says that von Schmettau had returned home, but that Stosch planned to stay on into the winter. Cf. Richard Engelmann, "Briefe von Philipp von Stosch an Matteo Egizio in Napel", in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, VI (1907), 526-548.

[9] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 297; Justi, *Winckelmann* ..., II, 265-267.

[10] Egizio (1674-1745) was a Neapolitan antiquarian and archaeologist, later a member of the embassy staff in Paris, and just before his death appointed librarian in Naples. Cf. note 8 above.

[11] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 297; *Archiv* ..., VI, 327.

visited Naples and had been permitted to go down a rope ladder into the shaft sunk by Prince Elboeuf on his estate at Portici, at the bottom of which the ancient city of Herculaneum had recently been discovered. There he saw some of the first excavations, and the statues which were removed to distant museums before the Neapolitan government closed the excavations in 1716.[12] Stosch's friend, Egizio, had begun to write about the excavations, and they were corresponding about them.[13]

In 1717 Stosch resumed his travels, but stopped shortly after crossing the Alps. He had attracted the attention of Count Flemming, who now induced him to enter the service of the Elector of Saxony. His position was that of substitute for a minister incapacitated by illness, who had been charged with the Elector's diplomatic correspondence in the Hague. Perhaps Stosch hoped that this would lead to a permanent diplomatic appointment, but he was handicapped by lack of money and social position and never realized his dream. In addition to his diplomatic post, the Elector had made him a royal antiquarian. Unfortunately, the death of his patron, Pope Clement XI, cut off his pension, and at the same moment his mission at the Hague ended. The Elector offered to continue him in the subordinate post of royal antiquarian, but he proudly refused the small salary and announced that he had decided to abandon diplomacy as a career.[14]

While at the Hague, he had found opportunities to please important people. He presented to King Frederick William I a rare book for which the king had searched in vain, and which he himself had been able to find. He procured the return to the Regent of France of a valuable Chinese manuscript stolen from the Royal Library, supposedly by the Protestant clergyman, Jean Aymon. Stosch was rewarded with a French pension of a thousand francs.[15] But most important of all was the renewal, at the Hague, of the friendship with Fagel at whose house he lived. Possibly

[12] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 297. The villas of Portici and the Favorita covered the sites of suburbs of Herculaneum. The Austrian prince Elboeuf discovered the buried city in the course of the digging of a well in a wood near his palace. He removed a great many valuable statues and other finds between 1709 and 1716. Cf. Amadeo Maiuri, *Herculaneum* (Rome, no date), 4-5.

[13] *Archiv* ..., VI, 328.

[14] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 297-298.

[15] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 298; Richard Engelmann, "Die Manuscripte des Barons Philipp von Stosch", *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, XXIX (1926), 555. H. Omont, "Le vol d'Aymon a la Bibliothèque du Roi et le baron de Stosch", *Revue des Bibliothèques*, I (1891), 468-469, gives great credit to Stosch and condemns Aymon as a thief. Léopold Delisle, *Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale*, I (1868), 329-332, gives the same version. Protestant writers (cf. Haag, *La France Protestante*, I [Paris, 1846], 202-204) vigorously deny Aymon's guilt.

through him, although Lord Carteret is believed to have been largely responsible, Stosch received an unofficial appointment,[16] which supplied him with a career and an income for the rest of his days.

The pope had a very important guest in Rome in James Stuart, the Old Pretender, known there as the " Chevalier de S. George ". He lived on the pope's bounty and married, with some difficulty, the Polish princess, Marie Clementine Sobieska. Although most foreign powers avoided recognizing the Pretender, the dignitaries of the Church treated him as a royal personage. The birth in 1720 of his son, Prince Charles Edward, raised hopes and made the situation more embarrassing, especially for the country whose crown James claimed and against which the intrigues were directed.

In 1721 Lord Carteret appointed Stosch special agent in Rome to watch the Pretender[17] and his court. He was an ideal choice because of his standing at the papal court and among other people in high places. These connections and his dealings with scholars who enjoyed papal favor enabled him to pick up gossip of all sorts, and even to have his right to this information recognized by the authorities.[18] When other gossip was lacking, he collected tales of the Pretender's relations with his wife, and circulated disagreeable and unreliable stories about their attendants.[19] So Stosch was able to settle down in Rome with his new income, work on his gem collection, converse with antiquarians and scholars about excavations in the city of Rome, and offer advice on artistic and scholarly subjects to any who would listen.

In 1724 his great work on ancient gems was published in Amsterdam, *Gemmae antiquae caelatae*. Bernard de Montfaucon wrote of the book with great enthusiasm, and spoke of helping Stosch with some of the details of publication.[20] This work established Stosch as the greatest author-

[16] Lord Carteret became Secretary of State for the Southern Department in March, 1721. Cf. A. Ballantyne, *Lord Carteret* (London, 1887), pp. 36, 66. He is said to have been a friend of Stosch, and he was intimate with Stosch's friend, Richard Bentley. Cf. J. H. Monk, *Life of Bentley* (London, 1830), II, 321.

[17] *Zeitschrift* . . . , VII, 298. Stosch was never accredited to the papal court, nor did he have any official position, but he was definitely recognized as an English agent by the Foreign Office in London. Cf. D. B. Horn, *British Diplomatic Representatives, 1689-1789*, Camden Society, Third Series (London, 1932), XLVI, 80.

[18] *Correspondence of Richard Bentley*, II, 632. Cf. also p. 337 below. Stosch was on good terms with three persons who were in the confidence of the Pretender: Cardinal Melchior de Polignac, Count Renato Imperiali, and Cardinal Alberoni. The first two were Stosch's principal sources of information about the Pretender. Cf. *Zeitschrift* . . . , VII, 298.

[19] H. A. H. Taylor, *The Jacobite Court at Rome, in 1719* [*Scottish History Society*, Third Series, XXXI] (1938), p. 126.

[20] Emmanuel de Broglie, *Bernard de Montfaucon et les Bernardins* (Paris, 1891), I, 276; Bibliothèque Nationale, *MS. français 17704*, fol. 172.

ity of his day on the subject of ancient gems, which were then being collected by many of his contemporaries. He not only worked on the identification of gems, but he seems to have been the discoverer, as early as 1714, of the fact that carved gems were signed. He learned how to make impressions of gems and to recognize imitations and forgeries.[21]

This ability to detect forgeries was doubtless very useful to his friends who were collectors. It may even be true that Stosch used his talents for a somewhat more questionable purpose. His friend, Ghezzi,[22] once referred to the trade in false antiques as an "old Roman custom".[23] Certain Roman artists and engravers admitted that they had made imitations, and more than one collector had been seriously cheated in his purchases. Some of these workmen had been employed by Stosch at various times for an unknown purpose, and it is not impossible that he had a hand in the profitable business of counterfeiting. His contemporaries seem never to have accused him of this, but thought of him rather as a dealer in genuine antiques who demanded enormous profits.[24] Whatever he undertook in the way of dishonest transactions, he had to conceal carefully, not only because his reputation would affect his access to the society he frequented, but because the papal government of the day kept a sharp lookout for swindlers of all sorts.

Rumors began to circulate about Stosch, and he did not wear well with some of his acquaintances. The Vatican librarian, Cardinal Passionei,[25] avoided him, and Ficoroni[26] thought him an arch-imposter. Bottari[27] remarked that he would like very much to see a list of the books Stosch had promised to write; another, of the things he claimed to have discovered; and a third, of the things he had stolen. Other people often thought him too positive in his opinions.[28]

By 1725, Stosch was talking restlessly to Bentley's nephew of his dissatisfaction with his position. Censorship in both England and Italy made his work difficult, and he could not collect the salary due him. He would

[21] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 333-334.

[22] Pier Leone Ghezzi (1674-1755), Roman painter celebrated especially for his caricatures.

[23] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 335.

[24] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 336.

[25] Domenico Passionei (1682-1761), one of the most learned men of his day.

[26] Francesco de Ficoroni (1664-1747), a collector and student of antiquities, and a prolific writer in this field.

[27] Giovanni Gaetano Bottari (1689-1775), a learned Florentine philologist and archaeologist.

[28] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 337.

like of all things in the world to retire to Cambridge and study, and should be happy, he says, if he was but Professor of Modern History.[29]

Soon after this, Stosch's troubles increased. The Pretender went to Bologna in 1726, then to Lorraine, and finally established himself in Avignon. He was required by the pope to return to Rome, officially because the pope would not condone his separation from his wife. But gossip attributed this action to Stosch's influence with one of the cardinals. When he returned, Cardinal Alberoni offered the Pretender the use of a palace with a garden which had a private gate through the city wall. As soon as Stosch heard of this, he protested vigorously, threatened the papal court with the dire consequences of the wrath of the English government, and demanded that the Pretender be kept where he could be watched.[30] The Pretender and his family were then lodged in the Muti palace, where they had previously lived.[31] Contemporaries, as well as later scholars, were amazed at the daring and success of an unofficial agent, in reality a spy and a Protestant suspected of atheism, who made such demands of the pope with regard to the treatment of his protégé and guest.

Stosch left Rome suddenly in January, 1731. According to his own story,[32] he was ordered to leave Rome by a member of the Pretender's suite. Four masked men attacked his carriage as he left a party at the palace of Cardinal Bentivoglio [33] on the night of January 21, 1731. The leader, at the point of a gun, threatened his life if he would not leave Rome within a week.[34] This tale has always been suspect. Some people believed that the baron invented it himself in order to have an excuse for leaving Rome. One recent scholar, von Kanzler,[35] thought that stories of his frauds were beginning to leak out. In other quarters it was believed that the pope wanted to get rid of him because of his troublesome tongue and his atheistic views. Others thought that English residents of Rome

[29] *Correspondence of Richard Bentley*, II, 632, 650.

[30] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 300; Johann Georg Keyszler, *Neueste Reisen durch Deutschland, Böhmen, Ungarn, die Schweiz, Italien, und Lothringen* (Hannover, 1751), 469-470. Keyszler says that the palace offered was "'alla Lunghara' in der Vorstadt". This answers the description of the Farnesina, and it may have been this palace which Cardinal Alberoni suggested.

[31] Baedecker, *Rome and Central Italy* (Leipzig, 1930), 228; Clennell Wilkinson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie* (London, 1932), 38, 43, 48.

[32] Justi, *Briefe des Barons Philipp von Stosch* (Marburg, 1872), Prog. 14.

[33] Cornelio Bentivoglio (1668-1732) received the cardinal's hat in 1719. In 1726 he became ambassador of Spain to the Holy See, and lived for the rest of his life in the Palazzo di Spagna in the Piazza di Spagna. Cf. C. B. Migne, *Dictionnaire des Cardinaux* (Paris, 1857).

[34] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 338; *Zentralblatt* ..., 548.

[35] Rodolfo von Kanzler, *Un congresso di Archeologi* (Rome, 1900), 8.

were annoyed by his prying into their personal affairs and gossiping about them. Such persons may have taken this means of getting rid of him.[36] The governor of Rome, Falconieri, was very angry about the vagueness of Stosch's report, and the pope spent three hundred *scudi* on a police investigation of the attack without finding any clues.[37] The story of the attack was believed by Stosch's friends, and the baron sent a message to the Pretender assuring him that he believed the attack to have been the work of one of his followers, but uninspired by the Pretender himself.[38] This version was widely circulated, and was quoted by Charles des Brosses in his *Lettres familières écrites d'Italie en 1739 et 1740*.[39]

Whatever the cause of his departure, Stosch reached Florence before the end of January, and was welcomed by resident scholars and antiquarians, as well as by the ruling prince. His house became the Mecca of distinguished travellers, English visitors, and learned Italians.[40]

But Stosch was in need of money, or pretended to be, and his move from Rome to Florence must have made his complaint plausible. Lord Chesterfield wrote from the Hague to Lord Harrington in London, on April 13, 1731:[41] "The Greffier has pressed me in the strongest manner to lay before your Lordship the case of Monsieur Stosch whose preservation or ruin depends entirely on the immediate payment of what is due him from England. He acquaints the Greffier in his last letter that the Pretender has left Rome and that the Duke of Ormonde is expected in Italy, which account is confirmed to me by a letter I received last post from Mr. Colman,[42] and these informations agree so well with those I sent your Lordship by the last post."[43] It is apparent from these letters that Stosch was still in the employ of the English government, and still enjoyed its confidence.[44]

[36] *Zentralblatt* ..., XXVI, 548; *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 338.

[37] Keyszler, *op. cit.*, 470.

[38] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 338; *Zentralblatt* ..., XXVI, 548.

[39] Fourth edition (Paris, 1886), I, 260. It is also given as a fact in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XXXVI, 464-466.

[40] *Zeitschrift*, VII, 339; *Zentralblatt* ..., XXVI, 548; DeBrosses, *op. cit.*, 259.

[41] Bonamy Dobree, *Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, Fourth Earl of Chesterfield* (New York, no date), II, 195.

[42] Francis Colman, English Resident in Tuscany, 1724-1733, died in Florence in 1733. Cf. D. B. Horn, *British Diplomatic Representatives* ..., 80. Stosch not only sent messages, but received his mail through Colman. Cf. *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, VI, 346.

[43] On August 12, 1729, before leaving Rome, Stosch had sent word, via Holland, that there was "something carrying on in Scotland in favour of the Pretender". *Chesterfield Corres.*, II, 123.

[44] Cf. Englemann, "Vier Briefe an Filippo und Rudolfino Venuti", *Archiv*

We are better supplied with information after Walpole began to deal with him. Although Walpole corresponded with Stosch and employed him, he did not trust him. He wrote of him as "Baron Stosch, a Prussian virtuoso and spy for the court of England on the Pretender. He had been driven from Rome, although it was suspected that he was a spy on both sides; he was a man of most infamous character in every respect." [45] "Stosch used to pretend to send over an exact journal of the life of the Pretender and his sons, though he had been sent out of Rome at the Pretender's request and must have had very bad or no intelligence of what passed in that family." [46]

Walpole's attitude may have been influenced by that of his friend, Sir Horace Mann,[47] who was an official agent in Florence, and who was suspicious of Stosch. Walpole advised Mann to pay no attention to Stosch, and wrote: "I don't approve of your hinting at the falsehoods of Stosch's intelligence, nobody regards it but the King; it pleases him, *e basta!*" [48]

In 1749 Stosch seems to have taken liberties with the diplomatic pouch. A man named Natter, whom Walpole later identified as an engraver of seals,[49] had left a note with Walpole, with instructions that it be sent on to Stosch, apparently at the suggestion of the latter. Walpole wrote to Mann: "I don't know who Mr. Natter is, nor will I be post to such a dirty fellow." [50] Walpole's letter to Mann of May 3, 1749, again showed annoyance at Stosch. "I must tell you", he wrote, "of Stosch's letter which he had the impudence to give you without telling the contents. It was to solicit the arrears of his pension, which I beg you will tell him I have no interest to procure." [51]

During all these years Walpole had relations with Stosch in another capacity, that of antiquarian, and bought gems and other works of art from him from time to time. On May 3, 1749, Walpole wrote Mann that Stosch

für Kulturgeschichte, VII (1908), 322-338. There is a parcel of letters from Stosch in the Record Office in London. These letters are not now available for consultation because of war conditions. Clennell Wilkinson has read them and reports that they are full of "backstairs gossip" and are "unreliable" historically. *Op. cit.*, 34. They seem to contain little about Stosch himself.

[45] Toynbee, *Letters of Horace Walpole*, I, 103, note 4 (Oxford, 1903).

[46] *Ibid.*, I, 344, note 4.

[47] (1701-1786), British envoy in Florence.

[48] Toynbee, *op. cit.*, I, 344.

[49] *Ibid.*, II, 188, note 8.

[50] *Ibid.*, II, 188.

[51] *Ibid.*, II, 374. Stosch may have avoided confiding in Mann because of a suspicion that Mann himself wanted the money. At the time of Stosch's death, he tried to get the money formerly paid to Stosch. John Doran, *Mann and Manners at the Court of Florence* (2 vols., London, 1876), I, 428.

had found for him a gold medal of Galla Placidia: "It is not for myself, but I wish you would ask him the price for a friend of mine who would like to buy it." [52] On November 26, 1749, he again wrote to Mann: "If you get out of your hurry, I will trouble you with a new commission. I find I cannot live without Stosch's intaglia of the Gladiator with the vase. You know I offered him fifty pounds. I think, rather than lose it, I would give a hundred. What would he do if the Spaniards should come to Florence? Should he be driven to straits he could part with his Meleager, too." [53] Stosch did not accommodate Walpole, for Mann received a letter, dated May 19, 1750, complaining: "Stosch has grievously offended me; but that he will little regard, as I can be of no use to him. He has sold or given his charming intaglia of the Gladiator to Lord Duncannon. . . . I still think it one of the finest things I ever saw and am mortified at not having it." Walpole later found that Stosch presented it to Lord Duncannon in return for his efforts in procuring the arrears of Stosch's pension,[54] a favor which Walpole had refused to undertake.

English visitors looked upon the "Stosch Museum", as they sometimes called it, as one of the sights of the city. They were often questioned about their visits by Walpole, and always about Stosch's collections, rather than his political activities.[55] Stosch seems to have acted as *entrepreneur* for all sorts of commissions for important Englishmen. One of the strangest of these occurred in 1741, and is mentioned by Walpole in a letter to Mann: "Lord Islay dined here; I mentioned Stosch's Maltese cats. Lord Islay begged I would write to Florence to have the largest male and female that can be got. If you will speak to Stosch you will oblige me; they may come by sea." [56] Then he wrote again: "I am quite sorry you have had so much trouble with those odious cats of Malta . . . fling them into the Arno, if there is enough water this season to drown them; or I'll tell you, give them to Stosch to pay the postage he talked of. I have no ambition to make my court with them to the old wizard." [57]

It is difficult to know how and when Stosch collected his books and manuscripts, nor do we have any idea how much he paid, or where he got the money. His archaeological library is said to have totalled six thousand printed volumes, in addition to his two thousand Greek and Latin manuscripts.[58]

[52] Toynbee, *op. cit.*, II, 374.

[53] *Ibid.*, I, 131.

[54] *Ibid.*, I, 131, and note 2.

[55] *Ibid.*, I, 203.

[56] *Ibid.*, I, 103-104.

[57] *Ibid.*, I, 237.

[58] *Zeitschrift* . . . , VII, 344.

Stosch's known occupation of spying did not seem to diminish the number or quality of his visitors. It was probably of Stosch that Lady Mary Wortley Montague wrote,[59] when she mentioned information received from an "English antiquarian" in Florence whom she suspected of being a spy. Walpole had spoken of him as a "spy on both sides", and a "person of infamous character", yet Walpole and Lady Mary both frequented Stosch's house.

Stosch died in Florence on November 6, 1757, and was buried in the Protestant cemetery in Livorno. Shortly before his death, his sister's son, Wilhelm Münzell, had come to live with him and had taken the name of William Stosch. He became his uncle's heir and took charge of all arrangements. Everything was sealed, pending appraisal for the tax of 7¾% due to be levied on the total value.[60] It was the nephew's plan to sell everything — library, collection of medals, gems, statues, drawings, engravings, and paintings, as soon as this could be done profitably. Initial efforts to sell large sections intact did not succeed, and many of the items were disposed of separately over a period of years.[61] Some time before August, 1760 William Stosch went to England, perhaps in the hope of speeding up the sale of his treasures.[62] He was following his uncle's practice of cultivating and doing favors for important people, and on March 17, 1761, Walpole spoke of some Burgundy wine which William Stosch had brought over from the continent for him or for Horace Mann's brother.[63] Stosch had hoped to get some sort of a position in England, and soon after his arrival he had solicited Walpole's assistance in obtaining an appointment as governor or travelling companion.[64] But he soon disappeared from the scene.

Two years before his death, Philipp von Stosch had corresponded with Winckelmann,[65] who had agreed to make a catalogue of some of Stosch's collections, which he did after Stosch's death.[66] The result was his *Description des pierres gravées du feu baron de Stosch*.[67] A catalogue of

[59] E. Rhys, ed., *Letters from the Right Honourable Lady Mary Wortley Montague, 1709 to 1762* (London, 1906), 309-310.

[60] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 344; Doran, *op. cit.*, I, 424.

[61] This is mentioned in Walpole's instructions to Mann to buy certain items, and Mann's reports of his success in getting them. Cf. Toynbee, *op. cit.*, IV, 130-131, 136-137.

[62] Toynbee, *op. cit.*, IV, 411.

[63] *Ibid.*, V, 38.

[64] *Ibid.*, IV, 434.

[65] Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768), the archaeologist and critic.

[66] *Zeitschrift* ..., VII, 344.

[67] Florence, 1760.

manuscripts to be sold at auction was also printed.[68] The heir sent a copy to the Vatican, together with a written list of the most interesting manuscripts,[69] in the hope that the pope would send a representative to the auction. Cardinal Passionei accordingly went to Florence, and purchased a great many valuable manuscripts at a very low price.[70] They were added to the Ottoboni collection in the Vatican Library.[71] There was no suspicion of dishonesty at the time of the sale. Had Stosch's nephew had any doubts, he would not have offered the manuscripts to the Vatican. The Vatican experts, who made a careful examination and drew up a report of their value,[72] did not question their provenance.

Not until 1876 did the truth begin to leak out. In that year, Léopold Delisle studied a number of Vatican manuscripts, including some in the Ottoboni collection, which had been bought from Stosch.[73] He found that at least one of these had belonged at one time to Alexandre Petau, then to Queen Christina of Sweden, and had been a part of the Reginiensis collection in the Vatican.[74] Delisle remarked: "I do not know how it got out of the Vatican to fall into the hands of Philipp von Stosch."[75]

In 1888, another distinguished scholar, Lucien Auvray, announced that "the majority of the manuscripts of the Ottoboni collection which are of interest to France, came from Baron von Stosch, who got them, not directly, but by an unknown intermediary, from Queen Christina."[76] It is to be noted that Delisle and Auvray were both convinced that some of Stosch's manuscripts had originally been the property of Queen Christina. However, evidence had not yet been found to show that any great number of them had been in the Vatican, although it was well known that most

[68] *Bibliotheca Stoschiana sive catalogus librorum bibliothecae Philippi baron de Stosch quorum auctio habebitur Florentiae die Januarii 1756 et seqq. diebus, Lucae, 1758, oct.* (sic).

[69] Vatican Library, *MS. Codex Vat. Lat. 7806A, fol. 81-85.*

[70] The Vatican possesses a very interesting copy of the catalogue used at the sale, with the prices paid marked in the margin. The writer was shown this book through the courtesy of Monsignor Count Stanislas Le Grelle of the staff of the Vatican Library.

[71] *Zentralblatt* ..., XXVI, 557; L. Auvray, "Les manuscrits du Baron de Stosch relatifs à la France", *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes,* XLII (1888), 707.

[72] Vatican Library, *MS. Codex Vat. Lat. 7806A,* fol. 81 ff.

[73] "Notice sur vingt manuscrits du Vatican", *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes,* XXXVII (1876), 471-527.

[74] This discovery was made by an examination of the library numbers marked in the volumes, and by a study of various contemporary catalogues.

[75] *Bib. Ec. Chartes,* XXXVII, 504.

[76] L. Auvray, *loc. cit., Bib. Ec. Chartes,* XLII, 707.

of Christina's manuscripts had gone to the pope and had been deposited in the Vatican Library, except for seventy-two volumes which were put in the Archives.[77]

In 1897-1899, Georges de Manteyer studied this series.[78] He found that the seventy-two volumes from the Christina collection which had been deposited in the papal archives had been intact in 1704.[79] Of these, fifty-three had disappeared some time after 1704, and all fifty-three were identified by De Manteyer as items of the Stosch collection. One of these was not sold at auction, but the remaining fifty-two had been purchased by Cardinal Passionei, who selected them because of their importance, without having any idea that he was bringing back volumes which had been stolen from the Vatican.

How did Stosch manage to obtain these manuscripts? He must have had access to the Vatican collections, as did other scholars of his day, but it is unlikely that he did the stealing himself, partly because this would be difficult to accomplish, and partly because detection would have ruined his standing in Rome. He probably attained his purpose by cultivating acquaintances among the Vatican employees.[80] Charles des Brosses, writing in 1739-1740,[81] described conditions in the Vatican Library as little short of scandalous. The librarian was never in residence, he said, and "in addition to the two assistant librarians, there are clerks (*clercs servants*), who are employed to copy or collate the manuscripts, an occupation about which they knew very little, but on the other hand they were dreadful thieves." It is quite likely that Stosch bought his manuscripts from dishonest employees in the Vatican and other libraries.

Stosch's honesty was questioned more than once by his contemporaries. De Brosses repeated an unsubstantiated tale of a visit Stosch was said to have made in 1714 to Fontainebleau to view the royal collection of gems.

[77] Information about these collections was kindly given the writer by Monsignor Count Le Grelle. Cf. my article, "Migrations of the medieval cartularies of the University of Orléans", in *Humanisme et Renaissance*, VII (1940), 102-122.

[78] "Les manuscrits de la Reine Christine au Vatican", *Ecole française de Rome, Melanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XVII (1897), 285-322; XVIII (1898), 525-535; XIX (1899), 85-90.

[79] By a study of inventories, including Bernard de Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum* ... (Paris, 1739), *tomus primus*, and Bibliothèque Nationale, *Ms. Lat. 1889*, fol. 57-95.

[80] Stosch once wrote to Bentley (July 9, 1729), about an "Abbé Rulotta", a *scriptor* of the Vatican, who was more ready to grant him favors than was the librarian in charge. Cf. *Correspondence of Richard Bentley*, II, 706-707.

[81] *Lettres familières écrites d'Italie en 1739 et 1740* (4th ed., Paris, 1885), II, 236.

A very valuable gem, the so-called seal of Michelangelo, disappeared, and members of the party were searched. Stosch was suspected and required to take an emetic, with the result that the gem was recovered.[82] The story, true or false, reflects the gossip about Stosch. Bottari's remark, quoted above,[83] shows that he had doubts about Stosch's honesty, and there are said to have been rumors of the same type current during his residence in the Hague.[84] It is therefore remarkable that none of his contemporaries suspected the fraudulent origin of his library. If he had had such a reputation, as von Kanzler in 1900 suggested may have been the case,[85] his effects could have been searched in the course of the strict customs examination required before they were permitted to leave Rome,[86] and many of his treasures may have been acquired after he left Rome. They could have been smuggled out by astute thieves without involving Stosch. Certainly the baron felt secure, or he would never have displayed his treasures to visitors, and his heir, as we have seen, apparently had no suspicions.

[82] De Brosses, *op. cit.*, I, 260.

[83] See above, p. 336.

[84] *Zentralblatt* ..., XVI, 555.

[85] Rodolfo von Kanzler, *Un Congresso di Archeologi*, 8.

[86] Stosch was not an accredited diplomat and did not have the privilege of exemption from customs examination. Cf. *Zentralblatt* ..., VII, 328.

DOROTHY MACKAY QUYNN

Duke University

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

Pope Innocent III and His Times. By JOSEPH CLAYTON, F.R.H.S. [Science and Culture Series. Joseph Husslein, S.J., General Editor.] (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1940. Pp. xvi, 204. $2.25.)

A popular biography of the greatest mediaeval pope is a natural addition to the excellent Science and Culture Series. Mr. Clayton's book is good reading; it is written in that peculiarly trenchant and forceful style which seems to be the enviable prerogative of English historical writers.

Pope Innocent is presented as the greatest of Christian statesmen, whose statecraft was doubly inspired by religion and law, by deep piety, and a long legal training in the great age of the canonists. The author follows the pontiff through problems enormous in their range and complexity, the duel with the empire, the crusades, the Latin empire of the east, the heresies, the misbehavior of kings, the Fourth Lateran Council, and the crushing task of the day-to-day administration of the Church upon which those problems were superimposed.

Mr. Clayton handles with sympathy and great common sense those questions, so vexing for a Catholic historian, which are involved in such events as the Fourth Crusade and the Albigensian War, wherein enterprises of the highest spiritual motivation and accomplishment entrained some grievous and deplorable excesses. His tone is uniformly eulogistic in respect of his great personal subject, but he is happily free from that unscholarly sentimentality *vis-à-vis* the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which has sometimes made such absurd claims for the period as to bring unjust suspicion upon the objectivity of all Catholic historiography. Innocent's real greatness is portrayed where it is most apparent, that is, against the background of the considerable violence, cruelty, oppression, and vice of the time, in high place and low, among clergy and laity. The age of Innocent III was not a golden one in the matter of human behavior. (Can that be true of any age since the fall of man?) It was golden because of the excellence of the remedies which were available within a universal Christendom for the perennial follies of men.

The author of a book for the general reader on this subject has a very difficult task in simplifying the complexity of mediaeval political thought and practice, especially in the matter of the relationship of the papacy to the secular powers. Mr. Clayton does this very well. Innocent's claims to the supervision of kings were never so extravagant as those of Boniface

VIII and his apologists. It was Innocent's extraordinary vigilance and activity in injecting his authority wherever he believed it rightfully belonged which has obscured, for some writers, his comparatively modest theories of the papal role in temporal matters. Of all the mediaeval popes, his views and his practice most nearly conformed to the classic expression of the indirect power of the papacy penned four centuries later by Bellarmine.

Mr. Clayton missed an opportunity to illustrate this difficult subject more clearly. He says that "Pope Innocent declared the (Great) Charter annulled on the ground that since both king and barons had made the pope overlord of England, no change could be made in the government and constitution without the pope's consent" (p. 170). This is not now the prevailing view. It has been pointed out by Professor George B. Adams, and repeated by Professor McIlwain, that the wording of Innocent's bull of annullment indicates that his grounds were not feudal but ecclesiastical. John's status as a vassal of the pope was a convenient channel for the royal appeal, but Innocent scarcely adverted to it. The annullment was an apt illustration of Innocent's own doctrine, elsewhere expressed, of the indirect temporal authority of the papacy in any kingdom, that is, the right to a jurisdiction not general but special (*casualiter, certis causis inspectis*) when a problem of justice or other moral considerations endowed a secular question with spiritual aspects. In this case, John's royal prerogative in government involved, for Innocent, such considerations.

There are some minor errors in the book. Serfs are described as being "under the burden both of military service to their feudal lord and of raising food" (p. 2). Serfs were not in a feudal relationship to their lords and they did not ordinarily owe military service. The statement is questionable that a university was so called because "all who could pay the necessary fees to lecturers might be admitted" (p. 4). *Universitas* was a common legal term for an association such as a commune, a guild, a corporation of masters and students, or any similar moral person. The cathedral school of Chartres is described as having been in the "territory of the English king" in the days of John of Salisbury (p. 3). Chartres was not in English hands until the Hundred Years War. It is hardly true that "no objection came from Bysantium" to the imperial coronation of Charlemagne (p. 6). Every imperially selected pope was not an anti-pope, as an expression on page 7 seems to suggest, and the description of Italian magnates who opposed the pope as "for the most part warrior brigands who had received their lands for services to the imperial Hohenstaufen family" (p. 74), while partly true, would leave great difficulty in the explanation of such Ghibellinism as that of Dante, later in the century.

A footnote on page 72 refers to the "Legends of a 'Donation' by the emperor Constantine", but the omission of any word about the celebrated forgery and its historical importance, once the subject of the donation is

mentioned, seems unwise. The general Catholic reader, who may never have heard of the matter, might most profitably hear of the forgery for the first time in Mr. Clayton's good context. He had already dealt fairly and clearly with the complicated subject of pious forgeries in connection with the False Decretals (p. 27).

ALBERT J. LYND

Harvard University

Jesuit Adventure in China: During the Reign of K'ang Hsi. By ELOISE TALCOTT HIBBERT. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. 1941. Pp. x, 298. $5.00.)

Here is a fascinating but quite uncritical account of the Emperor K'ang Hsi. The title, *Jesuit Adventure in China*, is unfortunate, for, although much is said of the Society of Jesus and its missions in China, the volume's primary theme is K'ang Hsi. In readable literary style the author tells of the conquest of China by the Manchus, and carries the story of the greatest ruler of that dynasty from his infancy to his death. As an interesting narrative the book has some value. As serious history it is so faulty as to be almost worthless. No effort seems to have been made to go to the Chinese sources. Those that have been used have been consulted only in translation. This in itself would not be fatal if the author were careful in the use of the fairly extensive materials in western languages. Many of these, to be sure, have been employed, but with insufficient background. Lao Tzu is spoken of as an historical personage, although his existence is highly doubtful, and his date is given as the fifth instead of the sixth century B. C. (p. 238). It is hard to see how anyone with a knowledge of seventeenth century European enterprise in the Far East could write that Koxinga's siege of the Dutch forts in Formosa "deflected the tide of Dutch immigration from the coast of China to Java and Sumatra" (p. 122). The Dutch were interested in commerce, not in immigration, and long before Koxinga drove them out of Formosa the center of their power in the east had been established in the East Indies. It is startling to be told, when one recalls the quantity and the beauty of the Sung wares, that "the real production of porcelain, as distinct from pottery because it was made of kaolin and china stone, commenced on a large scale during the reigns of the Ming emperors" (p. 209).

Especially lamentable, since so much use is made of the writings of Jesuit missionaries and so much is said of Catholic missions in China during K'ang Hsi's reign, is the ignorance displayed of these missions. Although he was undoubtedly the most prominent figure in obtaining for his Society entrance to Peking and in shaping its policies in China, it is not correct to term Ricci, "the founder of the Jesuit order in China" (p. 51). It is surprising to have the Jesuits described as one of the "sects of the Roman

Catholic church" (pp. 54, 241). Ricci did not settle in Canton (p. 54) but at Chaoch'ing, not far from Canton. The account of the journeys by which Ricci finally established a residence in Peking is quite inaccurate (p. 55). We are amazed to read of Benedictines in China in the reign of K'ang Hsi engaged in the Rites Controversy (p. 243). The author is apparently unaware that at the outset the Jesuits were not unanimous in supporting the position represented by Ricci toward ancestor worship (p. 243). Neither is it true that successive popes held contradictory opinions about ancestor worship (p. 243). To say so is utterly to misunderstand the decrees of 1645 and 1656. Moreover, the decree of 1645 was not by Alexander VII and it disapproved rather than "gave the papal blessing" to the Jesuit attitude to the rites as described by Morales. In the account of the Rites Controversy there is no appreciation of the complications brought by the Portuguese *padroado* and no mention is made of the important part played by the Société des Missions Étrangères of Paris. For the reader who wishes romance and entertainment and is not concerned about accuracy, the book has some value. To the scholar with a conscience for the facts, it is irritating.

KENNETH S. LATOURETTE

Yale University

Wings of Eagles: The Jesuit Saints and Blessed. By FRANCIS J. CORLEY, S.J. and ROBERT J. WILLMES, S.J. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1941. Pp. xiv, 206. $2.50.)

The Jesuit enigma! The mad M. Villemain, minister of Louis Philippe, crossing the Place de Concorde with a friend, points to a heap of paving stones, and exclaims: "Don't you see them? The Jesuits! The Jesuits! Let us run away!" The romantic De Maistre waxes slightly sarcastic in his *Du Jansenisme*, and boasts: "Il n'y a point de Jansenisme—c'est une chimère, un phantome crée par les Jesuites." Counsellors of popes, yet none of their number has ever sat on Peter's throne; bulwarks of ultramontanism, still they have been the trusted confidants of Gallican kings; sane moralists, sponsoring a system as old as Christianity itself, they could be loved by Louis XV and hated by his Madame de Pompadour. Always orthodox educators, the sons of Ignatius, succumbing to the *Dominus ac Redemptor*, could be protected by the enlightened skeptic, Frederick the Great. There was Francis Borgia, strange progeny of the line of Alexander VI; the gentle Aloysius, scion of the bloody Gonzaga clan; Campion, the Oxford don, once smiled upon by Elizabeth; Xavier, the Paris *magister* dying on Sancian Island. Small wonder, then, that a suspicious, albeit deeply respectful, throng of spectators has watched the forward march of this "least company of Jesus" and paid its tribute of curiosity.

Wings of Eagles, latest addition to the Bruce Science and Culture Series, is a Jesuit family album of one hundred and sixty-five saints and blessed, designed to give the answer to the Jesuit paradox. "For above all and through all that a Jesuit can accomplish, there is but one form of eminence on which the Society of Jesus will finally set its seal, and that is eminence in holiness." The veritable dust cloud of saints, blessed and near saints, which began to gather on Montmartre on August 15, 1534, is the solution to the riddle. Porters at the doors of colleges, simple lay brothers like St. Alphonsus Rodriguez, occupy the same place in the grand procession as the mighty mind of St. Robert Bellarmine.

The Bourbon family compact exiled 23,000 of them, and one of the youngest, Blessed Joseph Pignatelli, towers to eminent sanctity while he merits the title of "second founder of the Society of Jesus". Indeed, in the life of this "saint of the suppression", we can find the secret of Jesuit greatness. No religious habit, no organized houses, no set rules could hold together the followers of Ignatius between 1773 and 1814, and yet, even then, they produced a saint according to the Jesuit pattern. That pattern? "A man, an idea, a book." The soldier St. Ignatius, striving for the greater glory of God, bequeathed to his sons the greatest vehicle of spirituality our modern world has known. The *Spiritual Exercises*, the bible of the Catholic Reform, gives us the whole secret of the Jesuit achievement.

We commend this new addition to hagiography as a popular and dramatic presentation of the heroes of the First Legion. *Wings of Eagles* has a universal appeal. It should recommend itself particularly to the seminary and college professor intent on proving to his disciples that 1517, the year of the founding of the Oratory of Divine Love at Rome, is more significant for Catholic reformation than for revolt. The Church's essential holiness can brook no refutation. One hundred and sixty-five saints, produced by one religious congregation during a period when the Church was in "a state of siege", are a formidable apologetic.

THOMAS J. MCMAHON

St. Joseph's Seminary
Dunwoodie

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

Father De Smet: Pioneer Priest of the Rockies. By HELENE MAGARET. (New York: Farrar & Rinehart. 1940. Pp. 371. $3.00.)

This work is presumably a biographical study of Father De Smet and his interests in the Indian missions. But both author and publisher fail to mention that the book is as free from the method of history as an historical novel. Poor Clio, even with the best of intentions and methods, transgresses often enough. When, as in the present work, she is rapt by an

almost unrestrained imagination, she may expect the scorn of her more humble servitors.

Helene Magaret is a poet. It is obvious that her biography was written around a poetic conception, and that her research was a painstaking elimination of the irrelevant and impertinent facts which did not support her thesis. The author sees Father De Smet as a guileless, Assisi-like character who is horrified by the influence of the fur-trading white man on the Potawatomis. When the Flatheads send for the Blackrobe, he goes to them and conceives the dream of reviving the Paraguay missions in the valleys of the West. This is made the dominant incentive of Father De Smet's activity. It must also be admitted that some rather movingly tragic scenes are made possible by this conception. The expansion of America destroyed this dream, but lesser forces such as the opposition to Father De Smet of members of his own order, abetted the fulfillment of manifest destiny.

The thesis is the romantic one of quest of the ideal and frustration. Strangely enough, the author is weak where one might expect strength. He understanding of character is superficial to the point of sentimentality. She gives no convincing account of the Christian feelings of the Indians. She is unconcerned about church organization, labor, finances. In fact, the author is much more careful to depict the natural settings of events than to explain the human interests involved.

Although the author acknowledges her indebtedness to Garraghan's *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, she gives little indication of profiting from it. She follows the old view of Father De Smet as the typical missionary, whereas it is clear that he was more of a promoter, publicity man, and even financial agent for the missions. Father De Smet spent but a few years among the Indians, knew little of their language, was an able writer, financial administrator, and had some scientific interests. Helene Magaret is mainly concerned with Father De Smet as a missionary, and that large part of his life spent away from the western Indians is represented by a barren period of imprisonment. The author fails to reconcile the ability of Father De Smet as a diplomat with her concept of him as a guileless St. Francis.

It is impossible to consider the details of this work, for many of them are the products of imagination. Judged as an imaginative literary work it is not so unified as a novel, though it takes a novel's liberties. Nonetheless, it has interesting and exciting scenes, such as the cholera plague and the fire at St. Louis. Other parts of the book are marred by overwriting and by infelicitous phrases.

Though this verdict may seem harsh, the reviewer considers this type of book worthy of discouragement.

MATTHEW A. FITZSIMONS

University of Notre Dame

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

L'Italia medioevale dalle invasioni barbariche agli inizi del secolo XI. By LUIGI SALVATORELLI. *Storia d'Italia.* Volume III. (Milano: A. Mondadori. 1938. Pp. 656.)

This history of mediaeval Italy begins with the death of Theodosius (395) and continues to the death of the German emperor Otto III (1002). These six centuries of Italian history are not glorious, but they are full of interest and importance. Moreover, they are difficult to study because in this period Italy becomes the battleground where so many foreign and barbarian invaders settle their conflicts.

Professor Salvatorelli has surmounted these difficulties by a thorough examination of all the sources and literature on this subject, and has written a clear and comprehensive account. Briefly, the ten chapters of his book cover: the Byzantine influence, the barbarian invasions of Alaric and the Visigoths, of Attila and the Huns, of Genseric and the Vandals, the decline and fall of the Byzantine empire in Italy; and the powerful characters and exciting careers of Odoacer and Theodoric he describes particularly well. In fact, it must be noted in general that the author has exceptional gifts of bringing to life the characters of the past and he builds his history largely around the outstanding characters of these six hundred years.

After the reign of the Goths the tide turns in favor of Justinian and his brilliant general Belisarius; then comes the period of Lombard predominance. With the end of the Merovingians and with the rise of the Carlovingians the Lombard kingdom collapses and the popes become a temporal power in Italy. As the Carlovingian strength wanes, Italy is ruled by a succession of impotent princes until finally in 840 the Moslems invade the land. Then the country is divided up amongst local authorities; and at the beginning of the tenth century ruling in Rome is the infamous house of Tusculum whose control of the papacy brings such disgrace upon the Church. Then Otto I becomes emperor of Germany and takes Italy under his wing. His successors, Otto II and Otto III, adopt the same policy; and this establishes a precedent for a German domination of Italy.

These are the principal political events which Salvatorelli narrates. At the same time, and in its proper perspective, he discusses the religious situation. Adequate treatment is given to Gothic Arianism, to the disastrous heresies of Nestorianism, Monophysitism, and Monothelitism, and to the dispute about the Three Chapters. Nor does he fail to appreciate the roles played by the leading ecclesiastical figures of Epiphanius of Pavia, St. Leo the Great, St. Benedict, Vigilius, St. Gregory the Great, and Adrian I. Moreover the economic influences on the political and religious scenes are carefully noted.

The illustrations in this book are exceptionally fine. Aptly chosen and abundant, they have an historical value. Pictures are taken from contemporary coins, medals, mosaics, monuments, and documents so that the reader can have some assurance that these pictures correspond to mediaeval reality. Nowhere does the author reproduce modern paintings of what happened in the sixth or seventh century, as is so often the case in historical books. Included in the volume is a satisfactory bibliography, consisting of titles in all languages. This is followed by two detailed chronological tables and one genealogical table. Finally there is an extensive alphabetical index as well as a list of the illustrations.

In fact, all the critical apparatus is here with the exception of footnotes. Obviously the author did not intend his book primarily for professional historians. But since the treatment is so extensive and the information included so valuable, it is unfortunate that he does not refer to his authorities. The reviewer, for example, would have appreciated learning what were the sources for the following statements: under Majorian no woman under forty years could be consecrated to God (p. 65); a Roman council in 499 legislated that the pope in office should designate his successor (p. 120); Pope Theodore used drops of the Precious Blood to sign the decree condemning the ex-patriarch Pyrrhus (p. 293).

In most matters where there is a dispute between authorities, Salvatorelli explains the different opinions; but in the question of the Greek Schism (pp. 486 ff.) he is apparently not acquainted with recent research (cf. "Photius" in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, XII, cols. 1536-1604), because he still regards Photius in the traditionally unfavorable light. But these are very minor flaws in a book which can be heartily recommended to all those interested in mediaeval Italy.

HARRY C. KOENIG

St. Mary of the Lake Seminary
Mundelein

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Fourth Series. Vol. XXIII. (London: Royal Historical Society. 1941. Pp. 265.)

It is pleasant to note that wartime conditions have not interrupted the publication of the *Transactions* nor diminished the high quality of work emanating from the Royal Historical Society. The present volume contains six important studies. In his presidential address on "The Historical Bearing of Place-Name Studies: Anglo-Saxon Heathenism", Professor F. M. Stenton shows the relative paucity of heathen place-names in Northumbria as compared with Wessex, Sussex, Essex, and Mercia, and conjectures from this a possible reason for the willingness of the Northumbrian peasant to accept Christianity. A map of heathen place-names in England is subjoined to his paper. Miss M. Deanesly utilizes the knowledge pre-

served in Gregory of Tours and other Merovingian sources to project light upon the obscure origins of English minsters. Her learned study entitled "Early English and Gallic Minsters" is replete with items of interest to the ecclesiastical historian, such as the distinction between a bishop's parish (*parochia*) and his diocese (the former being the urban, the latter the rural territory under his jurisdiction). In an appendix she examines the provenance of four charters of foundation ascribed to King Aethelberht; some of the arguments employed to establish the authenticity of two of these are not entirely convincing. After an excellent summary of the little that is known about "The Relations between England and Flanders before the Norman Conquest", Philip Grierson offers the suggestion that only when a careful investigation has been undertaken of the textual relationships between early English manuscripts and those in continental libraries, will one be able to form an accurate idea of the relations of England with Flanders and other sections of the continent in the early Middle Ages. The map of Flanders at the close of the tenth century, which accompanies his paper, is too sketchy to be very useful.

In an able discussion of "Nationality and Language in Medieval England", Professor V. H. Galbraith explains that the "real nationalities of the early Middle Age were much smaller than those of to-day" (p. 114). Provincial districts such as Normandy, Mercia, Bavaria, or Florence were the first to inspire a sentiment of nationality; only later when these were absorbed by larger units did men come to think of themselves as French, English, German, or Italian. He points out that the feudal, or personal, bond was the dominant factor of mediaeval society, and that it was not until the fourteenth century that affection for the vernacular became associated with national feeling. The development of the formal promises made by mediaeval English kings at coronation, with their political and constitutional implications, is competently treated by H. G. Richardson in his brief study of "The English Coronation Oath." Some phases await further clarification, but until new documents are discovered the evolution of the oath will probably remain as Richardson, following the lead of P. E. Schramm, has traced it. For some time the court of equity which sat at Westminster as the court of duchy chamber has been mistaken for the chancery court of Lancashire. The confusion is evident in legal works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; Sir Edward Coke perpetuated the misconception and thus led modern authorities astray. In his scholarly paper on "The Duchy of Lancaster Council and Court of Duchy Chamber" (Alexander Prize Essay), R. Somerville reveals that, like the other great baronries, Lancaster had a council, and that the court of duchy chamber was nothing more or less than the duchy council acting in a judicial capacity.

RAYMOND J. GRAY

Xavier University

Benedictine Monasticism as reflected in the Warnefrid-Hildemar Commentaries on the Rule. [*Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, No. 478.] By SISTER MARY ALFRED SCHROLL, O.S.B. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1941. Pp. 217. $2.75.)

Discussion of Holidays in the Later Middle Ages. [*Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, No. 474.] By EDITH COOPERRIDER RODGERS. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1940. Pp. 147. $1.50.)

These dissertations originated in the seminars of Columbia University, Sister Alfred's in that of Professor Evans, Mrs. Rodgers' in that of Professor Thorndike.

Sister Alfred pictures Benedictine monastic life in the Carolingian era as revealed by the earliest known commentaries on the rule by Warnefrid, better known as Paul the Deacon, who sojourned for a while at Charlemagne's court, and by his commentator, Hildemar, a monk who lived in northern Italy in the course of the ninth century. The treatise shows such unusual understanding of things monastic that this reviewer should like to see the author expand her topics to cover mediaeval Benedictinism in general. It is a pity that thousands of students should be obliged to derive their knowledge of the spirit of monastic institutions from, say Workman, who, though he tried hard, did not succeed in penetrating to their essence. Even though reference had to be made continually to the writings of the two commentators, there exists no clearer account of the material organization of the monks, their household management, disciplinary regulations, devotional, intellectual, and social life. Sister Alfred proceeds in a straightforward, scholarly manner, in a pleasing style only occasionally marred by awkward or even useless sentences. "France" is used for *Francia* (p. 25). Bibliographical citations are occasionally repeated or left incomplete. These shortcomings, however, detract little from the compelling interest of the narrative or its intrinsic worth.

Mrs. Rodgers' subject also is of more than passing interest. In the Middle Ages, particularly in the later centuries of the era with which this treatise is concerned, holidays were so numerous that they were the occasion of considerable criticism. How to impress the people with the religious significance of these feasts and to secure their proper observance, became a problem even for an indulgent clergy. This problem persisted after Protestantism challenged the generous attitude of the mediaeval Church by reducing the number of holidays to but a few more than the fifty-two Sundays of the year. Mrs. Rodgers consequently does not hesitate to pursue her studies into the sixteenth century. Then, however, she does not always clearly distinguish between Catholic and Protestant views and measures in respect of the observance of Sundays and festal days. At times the terms *holyday* and *holiday* are used in a way that is confusing

to one who is accustomed to making a distinction. In a sense the opinion of the author of the *Letters of Obscure Men* about a student who read Terence on a feast day is of questionable value. One may hope, too, that Mrs. Rodgers will shortly round out her subject for the German-speaking lands with the same thoroughness here devoted to England and France.

FRANCIS J. TSCHAN

Pennsylvania State College

MODERN HISTORY

James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England. By HELEN G. STAFFORD, M.A., Ph.D. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co. 1940. Pp. vi, 336. $3.75.)

This work, originally presented to Bryn Mawr College as a doctoral dissertation, was considered worthy of publication by the American Historical Association. It is an interesting and well documented account of the political tug of war as played by Queen Elizabeth of England and James VI of Scotland in the years between the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, and the accession of her son to the English throne [1587-1603]. The English queen and Cecil, never scrupulous in their methods and persuaded also that Protestant solidarity in Scotland was the best protection of the border against a possible invasion from the north, with well placed bribes and promises, encouraged and supported the Presbyterian Kirk and the rebellious Protestant nobles against James, so as to prevent that cautious young king from feeling very secure even of his own throne. Though he was the nearest of kin, Elizabeth steadfastly and advisedly refused to name James as her heir. Yet she dangled before him the hope of succession "should he give no cause for exception." She ignored incidents which could be considered "exceptions", such as his dangerous understanding and correspondence with Essex, thereby revealing her secret recognition of his right. Her pensions and her intrigues kept him well enough in hand.

James on his side was willing and anxious enough to be courted by Elizabeth. Yet the intrigues within his distracted country fomented from England, the fate of his mother, and the Spanish Armada were reasons for not surrendering completely to her.

His mother's captivity in England he condoned, and in her judicial murder he silently acquiesced, considering the sacrifice of any natural affection which might have survived in him part of the necessary price he had to pay for his own advancement. He temporized and shifted from one party to another. Not certain whether Catholics or Protestants would eventually triumph, though probably a Protestant at heart, he had his allies among the Catholics. His own Catholic nobles, the English and Scottish Catholic exiles, furnished James an advantage which he might use if necessary while

he himself cultivated friends in Protestant and anti-Spanish Europe. Through his wife Anne of Denmark, who became a Catholic around 1600, and through other continental agents, if not by direct communication himself, he promised the pope and Catholic princes toleration for the Church in return for the assistance they might give him.

The author has made a special study of James' relations with Essex, whom he dangerously cultivated until the fall of that favorite, when the resourceful monarch unconcernedly returned to an understanding with the crafty Cecil as the one in best position to further his purpose. In the end it was due rather to the general conditions in Europe, over which he had no control, that he was allowed quietly to ascend the throne vacated by Elizabeth in 1603.

The bibliography is quite complete. Pastor's *History of the Popes* is used to illustrate the attitude of Pope Clement VIII in the affair of the succession. Father Pollen is given proper credit for his researches. Lingard's account of James before 1603 is characterized as "slight and accurate" and his history in general as written "from the Catholic point of view." One might regret the rather frequent use of "papist" for "Catholic", although there is no evidence of any wish to disparage. One of the interesting appendices lists Elizabeth's pensions to James over the years 1586 to 1603 as amounting to £59,000, exclusive of other subsidies.

The book is both well written and well printed, and it is furnished with a very good analytical index. We congratulate the author and wish her success in her future efforts.

MICHAEL J. HYNES

Seminary of Our Lady of the Lake
Cleveland

The Development of Religious Toleration in England. Vol. IV: *Attainment of the Theory and Accommodations in Thought and Institutions (1640-1660)*. By W. K. JORDAN, Ph.D. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1940. Pp. 499. $5.00.)

This volume completes Professor Jordan's study of the contributions to the ideal of toleration that were made in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It reaches an interesting conclusion. The author deems it probable "that religious toleration was gained in England principally in consequence of the decision of laymen that secular purposes would be most certainly attained by employing it as an instrument for the quieting of the chronic and ruinous struggle of a number of grimly determined orthodoxies to achieve mastery in the religious and political life of the nation. The most compelling of the numerous lay influences from which toleration was to spring was the conviction of political necessity" (p. 470). "The secular forces which were uniting upon the principles of

religious toleration were assisted, secondly, by the very rapid growth of rationalism and scepticism in the intellectual life of England" (p. 473). Very closely connected with the rise of nationalism and scepticism, and "probably more important for the development of religious toleration, was the increasing vigor of anti-clerical sentiment" (p. 474).

So, in the judgment of Professor Jordan, the layman's desire to be quit of controversy, to be at peace, to be free to carry on trade and enrich himself, had much to do with the development of religious freedom. Such an attitude could be based not on love of truth so much as expediency, and the tolerant attitude thus inspired would seem to be prompted more by religious indifference than by the true Christian spirit. It is neither by emphasizing the independence of man, nor by refusing to recognize the rights of God, that one may attain that harmonious union of duties, privileges, and facts that make up the formula of toleration.

It is curious that the theory of toleration "which stood substantially complete in 1660" (p. 9) was still not sensitive enough to include the rights of Catholics. Both Charles II and James II had to modify their declarations of indulgence to incorporate the prejudices of their parliaments with respect to Catholics. This, coupled with the striking fact of twenty priests being martyred for their faith within the twenty years time covered in Professor Jordan's survey, is eloquent testimony to Catholics at least, that the toleration conceived of by the Erastian, the sceptic, and the anti-clerical had its limitations. It is true, a fiction of law might be quoted to give legal foundation for these executions. But if the law itself was bigoted, what then? Any institution and any nation that penalized people for professing a Christian belief, and made it treason to say mass, could hardly be said to have possessed the substance of toleration. One might reasonably say that it was not in 1660 but in 1830 that the theory of religious toleration stood substantially complete in England.

In this book, as in the three preceding volumes, Dr. Jordan has given a close analysis of the writings of many men. Famous personalities such as Milton, Cowley, Prynne, Hobbes, and Jeremy Taylor are encountered and their contributions to the idea of toleration assayed. The tone of the book is highly objective. But the sympathies of the author are manifestly on the side of those who held for the least common multiple of doctrine. The Elizabethan idea is applauded. "She required for political reasons, . . . a reasonable uniformity of religious profession which she, quite as clearly as Hobbes, realized had little or nothing to do with uniformity of faith" (p. 479). "Hobbes misread the history of the future by his gloomy brooding on the history of the past. . . . In his desperate effort to destroy intolerance he created the possibility of a new and more terrible intolerance that would lack the ethical end which, to a degree at least, ennobled the search of the Middle Ages for an organic society" (p. 313). "He brought to conclusion the last grim deduction of Erastianism,—that religion must be

disciplined to the service of the state." "Hobbes stands convicted of a naïve and implicit trust in the beneficence and ultimate morality of those who wield an absolute political power—a naïveté quite as ridiculous and dangerous as that of those who struggled blindly, unsuccessfully, and often cruelly to attain in this world the absolute sovereignty of truth" (pp. 319, 320).

The author touches here the difficulties that have indeed resulted from seeking tolerance from the hands of the merchant and the politician. His book abounds with variations and shades of theories, personal, civil, and ecclesiastical, as they affected the idea of toleration. The historian of ideas has much to be grateful for in this scholarly and meticulous compendium. It would be an interesting and beneficial task for some scholar to take up the aspects of Catholic ideals of toleration as expressed not alone by the English lay mind but by such eminent leaders as Bellarmine, whose breadth of view was too much for the stomach of James I.

JAMES L. CONNOLLY

Nazareth Hall
St. Paul

The Irish Land League Crisis. By NORMAN DUNBAR PALMER. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1940. Pp. viii, 340. $3.50.)

Inspired by Professors Charles Seymour and Wallace Notestein of Yale University and David Owen of Harvard, Professor Palmer of Colby College has transformed his manuscript doctoral dissertation, through additional researches in Ireland and the acquisition of a proper perspective and sympathetic detachment, into a thorough and scholarly study of a critical phase of Irish agrarianism. Such studies coming from the leading secular universities make research in Irish history respectable, as it must be when freed from the emotional, intolerant, personal, and racial approach of amateurs. Here is a recognition that the Irish question has been essentially an economic problem at least since the revolt of 1798 and that it was predicated on a conflict between the Irish clan tenure or gavelkind and the superimposed feudalism of the conquering Normans and English, who did not recognize occupiers' rights. This was fundamental. The social, agrarian cause of Irish turmoil and disturbance was recognized by the Young Irelanders, intensified by the famine, relieved by mass death and emigration, dodged by O'Connell and his repealers, ignored by landlords and ecclesiastics of the rival churches, sensed by the republican Fenians, and understood by Michael Davitt and his Land Leaguers, who finally obtained the support of Parnell, most of the Irish members of parliament and the Catholic clergy, who were frightened by the terrible distress of 1879-1881 when only world-wide relief prevented a second famine and a second exodus.

Approaching his subject with a judicial understanding, Professor Palmer interprets the land problem, the effects of specialized agriculture, the viciousness of exaggerated absenteeism, the 20,000 landlords of whom one-third owned half of Ireland, the backwardness of hand farming, the depression of rack-rented tenants-at-will, the accountable ignorance of the peasantry, the lack of a middle class, and the failure of the well-intentioned Landlord and Tenant Act of 1870, and the Compensation for Disturbance Bills. Therewith, he pictures the sad land in 1879, exhibits Canon Burke of County Mayo as a harsh landlord, introduces Davitt and Devoy, shrewdly depicts Captain Boycott, agent for the Earl of Erne, and the patriot priest, John O'Malley, and indicates agrarian crime, the failure of law, and the impossibility of the old coercion.

All this leads to the Land Act of 1881, which the author should have described in its principles and working instead of merely stressing the conflicting attitudes with which the law was received. Soon no one was satisfied with what Edmund Burke would call this "lenitive" measure—whether he was a landlord or an occupier seeking his "Three F's" at law, a patriot or a professional agitator, a priest, a parson, or a presbyter, or a prelate so far apart politically as Archbishop McCabe of Dublin or "Rock of Cashel" Croke, the popular archbishop of Cashel.

Yet while the Land League and Gladstone gave Ireland a statute, which lawyers could not interpret, it ended the old landlordism and ushered in an era of reform and hopeful constitutional revolt. Strangely the Land League soon died. Its leaders were in Kilmainham or Portland gaols. The No Rent Manifesto of William O'Brien and his fellow signers, while in result not unlike the mob risings against foreclosures in the American Midwest during the depth of the depression, seemed fearfully radical in a country which worshipped greenacre. Anna Parnell's effort to organize a women's auxiliary of the Land League aroused ridiculous charges and fears for Irish womanhood. Ireland might be revolutionary but her people at large and her institutions were conservative. Her leaders lost their reactionary following when they turned a bit to the left in a struggle to give reality to the natural rights of man.

RICHARD J. PURCELL

Catholic University of America

The Diary of Gino Speranza. Italy, 1915-1919. Edited by FLORENCE COLGATE SPERANZA. Two Volumes. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1941. Pp. xxvii, 406; 336. $6 a Set.)

These handsomely bound and beautifully printed volumes contain an account of interest to Italians as well as to Americans. Not only was their American-born author unusually well fitted to observe events in Italy, but it was his mature desire to interpret each country to the other; so strong

was this desire that he almost consistently identified himself with both countries in his use of the plural personal pronoun. Trusted by the American ambassador in Rome, he officially summarized Italian newspaper opinion for the embassy; trusted by Italian military authorities, he accepted the many opportunities given him for intimate and often dangerous observation of mountain warfare. Recording his experiences and impressions simply and in descriptive detail, he has left a picture of Italy in the war years at once clear and complex.

The diversity of topics discussed should attract a variety of readers. Students of politics will follow with interest the accuracy of Speranza's intuitions as they are supported by events, his estimate of the fluctuations of Italian opinion on the aims of the war, Wilson and the League of Nations, his analysis of the Italian party system, and his evaluation of the editor Mussolini. Students of history will find echoes of the *Risorgimento* in his bitterness toward Austria and Church diplomacy, and his uniform enthusiasm for the Italian armed forces, especially the *irredenti* volunteers. All travellers who love Italy will have their heart strings pulled by his tender and affectionate recording of the Italian scene, and stirred by that of the "blackout" in Venice. All Americans may profit from the large portions of the book devoted to the war and the peace. Although the diarist expresses unbounded admiration for the courage of the Alpini and of American aviators, he realistically sets forth the conflicting views of generals and politicians, the sordid jealousies among the military and diplomatic officers of the Entente in regard to the operation and cost of the war, credit for success, the efforts of whole peoples to evade blame for failure, and the petty personal intrigues behind the fighting lines. No veil is drawn over the undisguised self-interest of all nationalities; idealism, where apparent, is well assessed.

Catholics may find his comments on ecclesiastical matters confusing. The preface by Arthur Livingston leads one to expect an increasing prejudice against Catholicism in theory and practice (a bias which did not extend to persons) and a glorification of the "Protestant tradition" in America. The diary, however, presents a strange compound of attraction to, and suspicion of, things Catholic. The color and grandeur of Catholic ritual impressed the writer, as quaint local observances captured his fancy. Although in nineteenth century fashion he regarded religion as non-intellectual, he appreciated and at times expressed an ingenuous reverence for the Christ Child and for the Virgin Mother. Such criticism of the Church as appears in the work is largely on political questions; relatively infrequent, it is unsparingly sharp. Speranza opposed the restoration of the pope's temporal sovereignty, thought Vatican diplomacy inspired by a desire to save the Hapsburgs, and tended to look upon papal pronouncements as politically rather than doctrinally oriented. He believed these attitudes were shared by Catholic as well as non-Catholic Italians; they clearly

reflect the intensity of Italian nationalism and the cruel division of loyalties which confronted Catholic consciences in Italy during the last seventy-five years. Interspersed among these comments one comes upon sound appreciation of the social services of the Church in the development of schools, hospitals, and charitable institutions. Saint Mark's in Venice had for the journalist a particular fascination, and he spends pages on its charm and the measures used to protect it from the ravages of war, time, and the waves. From the whole emerges the portrait of a real personality.

ELIZABETH M. LYNSKEY

Hunter College

AMERICAN HISTORY

Henry de Tonty, Fur Trader of the Mississippi. By EDMUND ROBERT MURPHY. [Institut Français de Washington.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1941. Pp. ix, 129. $2.00.)

Both the author of this book and Professor Bolton who wrote the foreward, deplore the long recognized neglect "which Henry de Tonty has suffered at the hands of historians . . . —or perhaps injustice is the better word." The panegyrical and one-sided effusions of La Salle's admirers during the second half of the last century are in great part responsible for this state of affairs. The book, though necessarily limited in scope and further limited by the fact that the author did not have access to more abundant documentation, is a commendable attempt toward remedying this situation. As indicated by the sub-title, the book is not a full-length biography of Tonti (the reviewer regards this spelling as the correct one). Mr. Murphy is primarily interested in Tonti's activities as a fur-trader, and secondarily in his extensive travels "from near Hudson Bay in the North to the Gulf of Mexico in the South." These travels are illustrated by a fine map of the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi basins.

One of the marked features is the account of Tonti's early life which gives a unified presentation of the scattered bits of information concerning Tonti before his coming to America. The single text about his having married in Canada is, in the reviewer's opinion, a scribe's error. If he had married, it would be strange that the extant records of the time fail to mention the marriage of one who was then so prominent in public affairs, and also that there is no allusion whatever in the abundant documentation, except this single instance, to Tonti's wife.

The translation of twelve documents relating to Tonti is given in the appendix. It is unlikely that the first letter here printed was sent to Bernou. Bernou's name was supplied by the person who made the copy for the Library of Congress from the original in Paris. The letter itself appears in Margry, III, 564, and Margry gives Cabart de Villermont as

the addressee. In view of the fact that several letters of the Tonti brothers are addressed to this protector of the Tonti family, including, by the way, one which Mr. Murphy himself has translated (pp. 116-117), Margry is more probably correct. The textual differences noticed in this first letter by Mr. Murphy merely exemplify Margry's deficiencies as a copyist. It should further be noted that "la demoiselle Tonty" (p. 109, note 2) is neither a sister of Henry, as Alvord supposed, nor one of his brothers, as Mr. Murphy too ingeniously surmises; she is Anne Picoté de Belestre, the wife of Henry's brother, Alphonse. Several misprints occur: to mention only one, "M. de Vingtmille" should be "M. de Vintimille" (p. 8).

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Loyola University
Chicago

Montcalm et ses historiens: Etude critique. Par L'ABBÉ GEORGES ROBITAILLE. (Montréal: Granger Frères. 1936. Pp. 241.)

In a field which has too frequently been treated with sentimentality, it is refreshing to find a work such as Father Robitaille's critical interpretation of Montcalm and his historians. The author, conscious of the errors and prejudices of many of his predecessors, makes a genuine effort to present an accurate portrait of the conqueror of Carillon, towards whom he is entirely sympathetic.

Because he led the French forces at the time Canada passed definitely into the hands of the English, the Marquis de Montcalm has been the object of much unjust criticism on the part of French-Canadian historians. The study of Garneau (1845), accepted for many years as a standard work on the subject, reveals, as Father Robitaille points out, not only an appalling lack of information, but also an antipathy towards Montcalm which makes it unreliable as history. The *History of Canada* by Ferland (1865) did little to increase the prestige of the French general. Embittered by the recollection of Montcalm's failure to resist the English successfully, Ferland is ever ready to accept unfavorable testimony, without taking care to verify its authenticity. In *Montcalm et Lévis* (1891), Casgrain is found to be much more restrained in his judgments than either Garneau or Ferland. It is true that Levis is praised uncritically and Vaudreuil treated somewhat harshly, but for the first time, Montcalm, although declared inferior to Levis, is lauded for his initiative, his good sense, and his courage.

In Thomas Chapais' *Marquis de Montcalm* (1911), one finds the first true picture of Montcalm as man and soldier. Through the thousands of pages written on this period of Canadian history, Chapais was able to distinguish the true from the false; he verified all original documents available, used his predecessors without subscribing to their mistakes, and so produced a work of "critical research and profound erudition". While

giving full credit to Montcalm as a distinguished leader and a profoundly Christian gentleman, the book is by no means a panegyric, for the author makes no attempt to conceal what is unflattering.

In order to understand more thoroughly the forces which affected Montcalm and the fate of New France, Father Robitaille devotes the last chapters of his work to a brief analysis of the political situation in Europe at the middle of the eighteenth century. Here again an effort is made to dispel some of the old Quebec prejudices against Louis XV and his ministers. In answer to the charge that the alliance with Austria was a whim and that French Canada was deliberately abandoned by France, Father Robitaille introduces evidence from the writings of European statesmen and scholars in an attempt to prove that the Austrian alliance was forced upon the French king and his government. Contrary to the belief of some historians, the war had not been conducted with incompetence and extravagance, and the loss of Canada, although deeply regretted by the French leaders, was considered inevitable because the intense pressure at home prevented the shipment of food and reinforcements to the French armies in Canada. Gradually, as we read Father Robitaille's interesting chapters, the pieces of Montcalm's portrait assume a definite pattern. It is essentially the Montcalm of Chapais' searching study, a courageous and enterprising French general, an honest, patriotic, God-fearing gentleman whose scrupulous deliberation has too frequently been mistaken for apathy.

This critical study of Montcalm and his historians by Father Robitaille will be welcomed by all serious students of French-Canadian history. The documentation is careful and complete and the material is presented effectively. Perhaps the author is too conscious of the necessity of defending Montcalm; yet because we feel that he is constantly striving to be impartial, we readily pardon the inclusion of so many eulogistic passages.

We venture to predict that Father Robitaille's excellent piece of criticism will long be recognized as an authoritative work in the field of Canadian history.

CECIL MACLEAN

St. Francis Xavier University

Washington and the Revolution. A Reappraisal. By BERNHARD KNOLLENBERG. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1940. Pp. xvi, 269. $3.00.)

This volume is a critical study in the military history of the American Revolution. Though the author, librarian of Yale University, does not purpose to review the revolution as a whole, the "certain episodes and characters" in which he is interested involve the most significant part, perhaps, of the conflict; for the essay is concerned in the main with the relations between Washington on the one hand and the Continental Congress and Generals Horatio Gates and Thomas Conway on the other.

Challenging the conventional view of historians and biographers who see in Washington the heroic, infallible leader harassed by intrigues and stupid opposition, Knollenberg contends on the contrary that the commander-in-chief was not always correct in his military judgments, or above shifting to others the responsibility for his own errors. In the light of this more truthful insight into the chief actor's character, the author does justice to Gates' army career, exonerates Conway of caballing against Washington, and upholds as wise and patriotic the war policies of the Continental Congress.

The opening chapters dealing with Gates and the Northern army illustrate the methods used throughout the volume and its sixty-two pages of appendices. As against the historians and biographers who credulously reiterate the legend of Gates' incompetency and vainglorious intrigue, the author cites contemporary letters and diaries to show that Gates in command of the retiring Canadian expedition acted wisely in withdrawing from Crown Point and concentrating on Ticonderoga, that not spite but sound military considerations led congress to substitute Gates for Schuyler on the upper Hudson, and that circumstances (the dangerous threat to his rear from Clinton's lower Hudson army) "would not allow" Gates to demand of Burgoyne, in Washington's own words, "a more perfect Surrender". No basis in fact underlies the supposition that Gates plotted Washington's downfall; the Conway Cabal "is probably a myth". Falsehood also shrouds, the writer suggests, other significant incidents in the history of the Revolution (the volume proves several time-honored strictures on the Continental Congress to be pure fiction). All this, because the historians have ignored the evidence at variance with Washington's version of the facts.

The author admits that Washington is the towering, indeed the indispensable, leader of the Revolution; but he wants the truth told about him. Although not conclusive on all the issues they raise, these scholarly pages point the way to a fuller, more balanced understanding of the War for independence.

AARON I. ABELL

Nazareth College
Rochester

Texan Statecraft, 1836-1845. By JOSEPH WILLIAM SCHMITZ, S.M., Ph.D. (San Antonio: Naylor Co. 1941. Pp. x, 266. $2.75.)

As Dr. Schmitz states in his preface, "the story of the foreign relations of the Texas Republic has never been fully detailed." This in itself is somewhat surprising, for there is an abundance of material, much of it printed and most of it quite easily accessible, but investigators have confined themselves to studies of special phases of Texan diplomacy and to the relations of particular nations with Texas, and in this latter type of

study Texas has been the party of the second part. There has been a need for a comprehensive account of the diplomatic history of the Lone Star Republic, as well as for an account which, written from the Texas viewpoint, would have essential unity and completeness, and would set forth the several diplomatic ventures in true perspective.

Dr. Schmitz has written such an account. He has not essayed a definitive history, but has restricted himself to Texan efforts to get recognition and assistance from the United States and the leading nations of Europe, and to bring to a happy conclusion its strained relations with Mexico. Because annexation to the United States was the first aspiration and the final act of Texas, that phase of Texan diplomacy has always been the most absorbing and most stressed, but very properly the author has devoted only four of the twelve chapters in his work to that topic. After all, when annexation was a real hope or a probability, Texan diplomacy was comparatively simple, for it was single-minded. When the United States refused the proffered union, however, the foreign relations of the new republic became varied, intriguing, and interesting.

Again, many of us are prone to forget that Mexico regarded Texas as a rebellious province until the armies of Scott and Taylor wrung a reluctant acknowledgment that separation had been effected. We forget that for the entire period of Texas' existence as an independent republic it was always technically, and at times actually, at war with Mexico. The basic problem of Texan diplomacy, therefore, was to terminate satisfactorily that state of war. To the several and continuing attempts to solve this problem by negotiation, by enlisting the co-operation of other nations and Mexican rebels, and by aggression, the author gives their deserved central place in his story. The descriptions of the negotiations of Colonel Bee, James Treat, and James Webb, and of the alliance with Yucatan are the most interesting in the book.

Because the subject has been treated so thoroughly already, Professor Schmitz does not go into detail in discussing the final movement for annexation. He concludes his account by bringing into contraposition the United States' offer to annex and the British attempt to prevent that by effecting an agreement between Texas and Mexico, the while, rather anti-climactically, the scope of the Texan European negotiations was being extended.

The author has written a very useful volume presenting authoritatively, in brief compass, a well-balanced account of the important efforts of Texan diplomacy. The work is documented thoroughly and the citations and list of sources will be fine guides for the student interested in particular phases. One could have wished that he had used other than Texan sources, especially when discussing the motives and objectives of foreign secretaries. So, for example, the only authority for the explanation of why Van Buren and his congress refused to take action on annexation is Wharton's report to Austin. There are times also when the author should have taken more

pains to stress the fact that certain moves were simultaneous. But it is a definitely worthwhile work.

P. RAYMOND NIELSON

Creighton University

Holmes-Pollock Letters, The Correspondence of Mr. Justice Holmes and Sir Frederick Pollock, 1874-1932. Edited by MARK DE WOLFE HOWE with an Introduction by JOHN GORHAM PALFREY. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1941. Two Volumes. Pp. xxii, 275; 359. $7.50 a Set.)

Beautifully printed, splendidly introduced, critically edited by Holmes' one-time law clerk, well indexed, illustrated with photographs of the two correspondents, the Harvard University Press has given a perfect setting for this invaluable series of friendly letters covering nearly sixty years of the lives of the distinguished Mr. Justice Holmes and of the equally distinguished Judge Frederick Pollock, third baronet of that name, even though the latter was not Maitland. Here are two parallel lives of men of English blood, one the acme of culture as it could be acquired by one well born in Massachusetts and the other as it was developed in old England.

Holmes travelled via a select school, Harvard College, the Civil War (which he did not avoid as so many of his class did by hiring an Irish substitute), Harvard Law School, private practice, a professorship in Harvard Law School, and a place on the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts to the United States Supreme Court. Pollock, the son and grandson of jurists, travelled via Eton, Cambridge, Lincoln's Inn, a lectureship at the Inns of Court, a professorship in jurisprudence at Oxford, editorship of the *Law Quarterly Review*, editor-in-chief of the *Law Reports*, and a sinecure judgeship of the Admiralty Court of the Cinque Ports.

Pollock wrote many more books than Holmes, and he made a far greater contribution to the history and study of law through numerous articles and editorial labors. Pollock was a broader man in travel, languages, reading, and scholarship. Both were liberals in point of view, but not without hereditary limitations. Holmes was a bit less formal in his letters, less critical in his judgment of men and events, somewhat more vain and opinionated in a delightful manner, and a little less tolerant as might be anticipated in an unorthodox Puritan. Both were gentlemen and scholars of sturdy common sense and learned in the common and constitutional law. Both refused to be weighted down by honors and honorary degrees.

A lawyer will find interesting notes and asides on hundreds of decisions, English and American, running through these letters, some of which are pedestrian and some of which are brilliant in observations and quiet humor. He will find a valuable bibliography of treatises on the law in its various phases referred to in the letters. He will get Holmes' inner though re-

strained views of Justices Field, White, McKenna, Taney, Hughes (whom he suspected of presidential aspirations in 1912), Taft and Brewer, and of teachers of the law like Wigmore, Wharton, Pound, Langdell, Hannis Taylor (with his slight contributions in ponderous volumes), Chafee, Frankfurter, who gave Holmes quite a play as did Judge Cardozo. An occasional living man may blush, but in general the asides are generous, and Holmes like Pollock lived to bury most of his companions and associates with whom he was in earlier competition. Even judges are only judicial in degree.

Interesting are the sharp notes of Pollock on Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, MacDonald, Lloyd George, Cleveland (who did hire a substitute during the Civil War), the Venezuela Affair, the Northern Securities Case, the Panama Canal Tolls, the Bryces and his friend, Mrs. Erskine Childers, whose author-husband incidentally was a martyred victim of the Irish troubles in 1922. Pollock admired Lord Russell of Killowen for his vigorous efforts to reform legal education and arouse an interest in legal scholarship; but as a scholar, Pollock thought lightly of Chesterton, Wells, Shaw, and Belloc who is described as "flashy, impudent and not too scrupulous about facts". Pollock's interest in historians was enlarged no doubt by his son, who published *The Popish Plot*.

Holmes was annoyed by liberal attacks on rugged capitalists like Hill, by Hannis Taylor's argument before the Supreme Court against the constitutionality of drafting men for overseas service, by Theodore Roosevelt's refusal to understand his dissent in the Northern Securities Case, by the criticism of Eugene Debs' conviction under the Espionage Act and not because he was an agitator, and by the failure of Wilson to pardon the obstructionists convicted under this act. As a liberal, he had stood for freedom of speech and civil rights in general. His letters indicated a weakness for liberals: the *New Republic* group, Frank Hackett, Bertrand Russell, Harold J. Laski whom he met through Felix Frankfurter, but not for Charles Beard's *Economic Interpretation of the Constitution*. For Irishmen, he had a becoming condescension. Laski's background proved troublesome as to whether he was a non-practicing Jew or possibly of Polish Catholic background, and footnotes do not aid the text of the letters. In speaking of the prejudice of Boston against Laski and Frankfurter partly because they were Jews, Holmes continued:

> It never occurred to me until after the event that a man I like is a Jew, nor do I care, when I realize it. If I had to choose I think I would rather see power in the hands of Jews than in the Catholics—not that I wish to be run by either.

Nor would he agree with Justice Brandeis' insistence upon the superiority of the oriental mind. Holmes seemed fearful of all the Adamses and more especially of the erratic but inspiring Brooks Adams. He was critical of

Eliot Norton and worried about Judge Rugg's alleged manipulations to succeed him on the bench.

Pollock was more critical of advanced liberals, yet he grieved that the Scottish and London universities were becoming as conservative as Oxford and Cambridge. He had no hesitancy to express sympathy for Ireland or to refer to the fanaticism of the Anglo-Scottish Protestants in Ulster. Of Mr. Laski, he wrote: "He is not too old to shake off the obsession of church history. If he does not his work will be permanently lop-sided." Apparently Laski has done just this and presumably saved himself. As a mathematician, he held Bertrand Russell one of a half-dozen in the world, but otherwise he gave him no character: "As philosopher, wrong to my mind but brilliant, certainly clever enough to know that one may think himself a valiant fellow for throwing stones at God Almighty's windows, or a sage for being cocksure that there are no such windows nor any house at all, but not both at once. . . . As citizen, thoroughly bad. He did much mischief, which still works, among young people at Cambridge during the war, and was mixed up with the sort of pacifists who did not stick at falsifying evidence" (II, 159).

At forty-three years of age, Holmes did not mind growing old, while forty years later he was wading through Lea's *History of the Inquisition in Spain*. He was probably relieved when Pollock wrote: "Certainly not a few learned and judicious historians are dull." Unlike Baron Blackburn, who, on retirement as lord of appeal in ordinary, said "damn the law," and turned to French novels, Holmes continued to read solid books, chiefly history. He predeceased Pollock, who lived long enough to take a personal interest in the early plans for the publication of these volumes.

RICHARD J. PURCELL

Catholic University of America

LATIN-AMERICAN HISTORY

The Development of Hispanic America. By A. CURTIS WILGUS. (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc. 1941. Pp. xviii, 941. $4.75.)

This impressive volume is notable for its teachable qualities and for its encyclopaedic reference character. The technical craftsmanship is superior. The type is clear, the paper easy on the eye, the printing devices adapted in the best manner to the needs of undergraduates. A series of one hundred and twenty-one maps and charts illustrates the manifold details of geography, ethnography, population, climate, agriculture, and natural resources. Avoiding interpretative writing as a general rule, the work lays stress on concrete data, and the scope of this information is so wide that the reader readily concedes that only a scholar of long experience could amass so much correlated fact and especially so ample a store of footnotes and

bibliography relating to current research. Nearly every page lists recent studies in some particular section of the field covered. The work closes with a representative list of writings in various languages dealing with Hispanic America.

The plan of the book considers first the background matter, then the discovery and colonial development, and the movement toward independence. The major portion is occupied with a survey of the modern Hispanic states and of their international relations. Professor Wilgus is at his best in presenting a clear outline of his material, and in offering student aids and library directions. Each chapter has a large book list. A glossary of Spanish and Portuguese terms, and a set of outlines of Hispanic American constitutions, complete the tool-shop for the enterprising upper classman.

But when one considers the book for class use, he will be struck by several strange deficiencies manifested throughout the story. Dates given in the bibliographies need careful rechecking, as do several titles listed. The condensed treatment of the republics, such as that of Uruguay, opens the way to many mistakes in emphasis, yet in fairness to authorship one may overlook such discrepancies that are almost certain to accompany excessive simplification. A deeper fault is the liberalist attitude exhibited in discussing cultural matters, an attitude that militates against serious historical method and detracts heavily from the respect that would otherwise be given to this production. President Hutchins could here find much to implement his description of liberal thought as seeking, not the right and power to do things, but "freedom" *from* things—thought, worship, work, and authority. It is an emotional tendency, betrayed in very careless statement of fact, though here one is inclined to suspect that the author incautiously relied on friends and assistants in compiling his story.

One might wonder, for example, what the editors of the *Documentos para la Historia de Argentina* would think of the following sentence: "Throughout the colonies the religious orders had little hold upon the whites" (p. 172). A sturdier yarn has it that "for two and a half centuries at least, it (the Church) was generally successful in stifling original thought" (p. 307); and on the same page the reader finds that "still another phase of religious life affecting thought in the colonial period was an intolerance . . . toward change of any kind." On pages 205 and 206 there is enough misinformation to keep a critic busy for ten years, should he wish to give the book such extended attention. The missions of Paraguay are made to support "200,000 armed natives"! Again, in only a small part of the colonial era is it true that "the orders in America were immediately subject to a commissioner general with headquarters at Madrid." One need not be too much irked at the caustic opinions of Henry Morse Stephens, who in a sour and inaccurate moment wrote that the religious expelled in 1767 "were no longer intrepid missionary pioneers, but a corporation of wealthy traders, who made use of their spiritual pos-

sessions to further the cause of their commerce." But to quote this with approval in 1941 betrays failure to use sources readily available, particularly when the statement is followed only a few pages onward by the listing of Pablo Pastells and Antonio Astrain. And Bernard Duhr is still on library shelves!

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Loyola University
Chicago

Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies. By JOHN TATE LANNING. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1940. Pp. ix, 149. $1.75.)

Brilliant and profound, this "small book on so large a subject", as the author modestly puts it, is an astounding revelation. Today, with the emphasis on cultural relations, this brief but illuminating little volume brings forcefully to mind the injustice of the generally accepted dictum that the three hundred years of the Spanish colonial regime were so many years of stagnation and abysmal ignorance. "If the detractors of the Spain of the conquest have at last been measured by the rod of reason, those of the Spanish colonial intellectual life", declares the author, "still march with their measure untaken." He goes on to point out that as early as 1538 the first university for the new world was sanctioned, and before even a college was established in English America eight others had been opened south of the Rio Grande. Modeled in the main after that of Salamanca, which in the sixteenth century surpassed all the universities of Europe, the twenty-three universities of Spanish America represent a transplantation of the scholastic system and its best traditions to the new world. Professor Lanning warns, however, that while it is true that "A few of them were universities in name only . . . it is not enough to say that the others were scholastic and decadent", for "in reality they were the very warp and woof of the church, without which a trained clergy could not have survived, and the very solid rock upon which colonial culture, in all its formal aspects, rested in closest parallel to that of Europe."

After giving a vivid picture of university life and administration in the Spanish colonies, the author estimates the number of students who received degrees to have been about 150,000, a fact not suspected by American scholars. The long disputed question of the priority of Mexico as the first seat of learning in the new world is definitely settled, a contention which the reviewer has previously defended. It may be stated that the University of Mexico alone had granted 29,882 bachelors' degrees and 1,162 higher degrees by 1775.

It is in the third chapter that the full development of intellectual endeavor in the field of philosophy is revealed for the first time. The influence of the various schools of thought are traced, and the reader is as

surprised as Humboldt himself was in 1800 to find that Feijoo's *Teatro Crítico* and the Abbé Nollet's *Traité d'electricité* were widely known in Spanish America before the close of the eighteenth century. In fact, by 1736 René Descartes, Leibnitz, and Newton were being taught and discussed in Quito. "The seemingly puerile elements of Cartesian philosophy which we reject so smugly today were also scorned by the colonial scholar", asserts the author. Locke and Condillac, too, were equally well known. The theoretical foundation of the revolt against Spain, it is pointed out, did not rest solely on the political doctrines of the French philosophers. Rousseau, Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Raynal gave a definite slant to the late colonial period, but it was St. Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, Newton, Condillac, Pierre Gassendi, and Malebranche, declares the author of this great little book, who formed the mentality of the intellectual leaders of Spanish America. The relative advance in the colonies is thus summed up: "The truth is that instead of having a cultural lag of three hundred years behind Europe there was a hiatus in the Spanish colonies of approximately one generation from European innovator to American academician." By 1800 even this lag had ceased to exist. It is somewhat of a shock to find a Spanish American visitor of this period appraising Yale as "inferior, trifling, and contemptible."

The last two chapters are devoted to the study of medicine and public health in the Spanish colonies. The reviewer feels that the development of this science in Mexico deserved a more detailed treatment. But in a general discussion of the advance made in all Spanish America little more could have been done. Wisely does Professor Lanning remark that "much remains to be . . . learned or relearned on the subject of Hispanic colonial medical culture." No one who wishes to understand the psychology and culture of Spanish America can afford to neglect this important contribution in a field so little known and so long neglected. May Professor Lanning soon bring out the detailed study he is preparing in two volumes of this fascinating subject.

CARLOS E. CASTAÑEDA

University of Texas

Life and Letters of Vasco Nuñez de Balboa. By CHARLES L. G. ANDERSON, M.D. With Introduction by Dr. Ricardo J. Alfaro. (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1941. Pp. 368. $3.50.)

Vasco Nuñez de Balboa is at the same time one of the most fascinating and one of the most unfortunate of the Spanish *conquistadores*. His untimely death, at the hands of the executioner, robbed Spain of one of her most promising colonial leaders and the native Americans of one of their truest and most sympathetic friends. Historians, more than once, have allowed themselves to wonder just what might have been the story of the

conquest of Peru, had the logical man, Balboa, lived to contact the great Andean empire. The story of the occupation of Central America, one of the least pleasant in all the annals of Spanish establishment in the New World, too, might have been very different, if only Arbolancha had returned a few months earlier to report to Ferdinand on isthmian happenings and personages. But such musings are idle. Balboa fell a victim of envy, jealousy, and shameful intrigue, cut off in the prime of life; and to less capable, when not actually vicious, men was left the task of extending Spain's dominion north and south from the Isthmus.

Unfortunate during his lifetime, Balboa has been scarcely less fortunate since his death—at least as far as historical literature is concerned. Centuries have passed and, until this present work, Balboa has never had a worthy English or American biographer. Sketches there have been, and quite generally sympathetic. Materials, it is true, are scarce, but that should not absolve historians for their neglect of a great man. Hence, to Dr. Anderson must go the thanks of the profession. His is hardly a definitive biography, but, awaiting that, a real gap has been filled.

Under the author's pen those first ten exciting years on the Isthmus come to life, years of hardship and suffering, of glory and achievement, of human greatness and human meanness. Civilization clashed with savagery, men reflected the conflict, and interesting was the result. In Dr. Anderson's study Balboa, as he deserves, continues to be the hero, even though not without blemish—courageous, capable, ambitious, but too much inclined to trust his fellowmen for his own good. Pedrarias is still the same crafty, jealous, cruel governor whom history has pictured since the days when Oviedo and Las Casas wrote. Without exculpating the governor of the death of Balboa, Dr. Anderson shows that Pedrarias was very much under the influence of his *alcalde mayor*, Gaspar de Espinosa, the man who sat in judgment on the *adelantado* and who, incidentally, fell heir to Balboa's ships on the South Sea, after sentence of death had been carried out. Quevedo, the bishop, though a sincere friend and admirer of Balboa, is credited by the author with having, indirectly at least, brought the *adelantado* to his death, by blocking the return to Spain for a hearing at the court. On this point one wonders if Dr. Anderson is both fair and correct in imputing ulterior motives to the bishop? The other figures, Ojeda, Nicuesa, Encisco, Colmenares, Corral, and the rest, show up in familiar light, often in considerable detail.

Dr. Anderson's chapter on *El Requerimiento*, no matter what one's opinion of that document may be, is quite unworthy of the calm and objective tenor of the rest of his study. His lavish use of unqualified superlatives of condemnation almost inclines one to put him in one of the two classes ("bigots and ignorant persons") into which he divided "nearly everybody" of the age of which he has written.

JOHN F. BANNON

St. Louis University

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association will be held at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, on December 29-31, 1941. On Monday, December 29, there will be a general session at which three papers will be read. The speakers and their subjects will be: the Reverend Victor Gellhaus, O.S.B., of St. Benedict's College, "The Persistence of the Crusading Idea in the Early Modern Period;" Sister M. Evangela, B.V.M., of Clarke College, "Bishop Spalding's Work on the Anthracite Coal Commission, 1902-1903," and Professor Francis A. Arlinghaus of the University of Detroit, "The Kulturkampf and European Diplomacy, 1870-1875." The luncheon conference on Tuesday, December 30, will be addressed by Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia University on the subject, "The Church and Nationalism." At the afternoon session on Tuesday there will be the general business meeting and election of new officers, to be followed by the presidential address of Dr. Marshall W. Baldwin of New York University on "Islam and Mediaeval Christendom." A joint session with the American Historical Association is scheduled for Wednesday morning, December 31. At this session two papers will be presented, one by Professor Arthur S. Aiton of the University of Michigan on "Nineteenth-Century Ideas on Church and State Relationships in Latin-America," and the second by the Reverend W. Eugene Shiels, S.J., of Loyola University, Chicago, on "Co-operation between Church and State in Nineteenth-Century Latin-America." The final luncheon conference will be held on Wednesday with two papers, the first by the Reverend Peter Leo Johnson, of St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee, on "Early Catholic Church Property in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee," and the second by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, on "An Appreciation of Research Studies in the History of the Church in the United States."

The meeting of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association will be held at London, Ontario, October 8-9.

The first of the inventories of material in the National Archives to be issued since the initiation of the new finding-mediums program is entitled *Preliminary Inventory of the War Industries Board Records* (xvii, 134 pp.). Other new processed professional documents include bibliographies on the arrangement and description of archival material (7 pp.) and on the conservation of cultural resources in times of war (9 pp.), and *Staff Informa-*

tion Circular No. 11 entitled "The Role of Records in Administration," which consists of discussions on German administration, by Ernst Posner, on American Federal Government administration, by Helen L. Chatfield, and on American business administration, by Edna B. Poeppel. Copies of any of these documents are available upon request, as long as the supply lasts, and a mailing list for future issues of the *Staff Information Circulars* is being established.

Since its opening to the public on March 17 of this year the National Gallery of Art in Washington has been thronged with visitors. It is open every day of the year except Christmas and New Year's Day. The hours are from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays and from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Sundays. The magnificent marble gallery, the gift of Andrew W. Mellon to the people of the United States, affords over 500,000 square feet of floor space. At present, it houses the Mellon collection of 126 paintings and 24 pieces of sculpture, representative of various schools of art from the thirteenth to the nineteenth centuries; the Samuel H. Kress collection of 375 paintings and 18 pieces of sculpture, devoted entirely to Italian art from the thirteenth to the eighteenth centuries; and a collection of 300 prints given by Miss Ellen T. Bullard and three anonymous donors. A thirty-one page booklet, *General Information and List of Paintings and Sculpture*, is given to visitors. The list is arranged according to national schools, with the artists in each school grouped alphabetically. *The Preliminary Catalogue: Descriptive List and Notes* (244 pages and 16 plates, Washington, D. C., 1941) is available at $0.50. In it the artists are listed alphabetically with some biographical data, a description of each work on display, and a few bibliographical indications. The *Book of Illustrations* (Washington, D. C., 1941), a volume of 246 pages, 226 of which are devoted to reproductions in black and white, is sold at $1.50. The arrangement is the same as in the *General Information List*.

Italian art, portraits, and religious paintings are the strongest features of the collection at the present time. Brief public lectures on the art of the gallery are given by the staff. During the summer a lecture was offered at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays, with guided tours of the gallery following the lecture. The delightful courtesy, happily so characteristic of our American public institutions, is found at its best in the National Gallery of Art.

Writings on American History 1936 by Grace Gardiner Griffin and Dorothy M. Louraine has recently been published.

The first eight-page number of the *State and Local History News*, bimonthly publication of the American Association for State and Local History, appeared in July. Mr. C. C. Crittenden, president of the Asso-

ciation, writes: "The Association will undertake to serve as the clearing-house for information on how to organize an historical society, how to mark historic spots, how to conduct historical tours, how to stage historical celebrations and pageants, how to preserve historic buildings, how to prepare and broadcast historical radio programs, and other similar topics." Membership is of three classes: annual, contributing, and life. For these, individuals pay $2, $5, and $50 respectively and institutions, $4, $10, and $100. All who are accepted by the Council before the first annual meeting at Hartford, Connecticut, on October 8 will be considered founding members. Members will receive the *News*. Applications for membership should be made to David C. Duniway, secretary-treasurer, Box 6101, Washington, D. C.

Creation of the "Princeton Archives of American Civilization in the Princeton University Library" has been announced. While the Archives eventually will embrace all phases of activity, efforts will be concentrated in the field of literature until methods of collection and organization are perfected. Diaries, manuscripts, and correspondence files of American authors will be collected.

A *Guide to Ten Major Depositories of Manuscript Collections in New York State* compiled by the Historical Records Survey, WPA, and edited by Harry B. Yoshke appears as Volume 39 (1941), Number 2, of the *Proceedings of the Middle States Association of History and Social Science Teachers*. Membership in the Association at $1 a year includes the *Guide* and the *Proceedings* (Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., Editor, Box 120, Teachers College, Columbia University).

Henry David, Harry J. Carman, and Paul N. Guthrie, who edited *The Path I Trod: the Autobiography of Terence Vincent Powderly* (Columbia University Press, 1940), have completed their examination of over 80,000 items from the Powderly correspondence which came to light at the same time his unpublished autobiography was discovered. This letter material is rich in information on the labor movement from the late seventies through to the nineties, on Powderly's life, on the Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor, and on several other topics. These items have been collated and transcribed. The editors are now selecting from among them a number of letters to and from Powderly for publication in a volume that should be completed within the next six months.

The Royal Ontario Museum of Archeology has undertaken the excavation of the site of Fort Ste. Marie. The old fort was the station of Jesuit missionaries from 1639 to 1649. The names of six of the eight Canadian martyrs are connected with the place.

An unconfirmed report brings the good news that the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* has been able to continue publication. No number has reached America since the first fascicule of 1940.

Dom H. Leclercq has been able to continue work on his *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* in London in spite of the war. He is working on articles under the letter T.

The Sacred Congregation of Religious has published statistics of the religious orders and congregations of pontifical rite, i. e., those groups which do not depend on the local diocesan authority but directly on the Holy Father through the Sacred Congregation of Religious. There is a total of 874 institutions with 789,338 members. The survey shows that there are 61 religious orders of men, those who take solemn vows, with a total of 108,347 members—priests, lay brothers, and novices. In addition there are 97 religious congregations of men, those who take simple vows, with a total membership of 105,067. There are 720 religious congregations of women, with a total membership of 575,924 sisters.

Volume III of the Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae of the Gregorian University (Rome, 1940) contains the edition by Angelo Mercati of various *Bollandiana dall' Archivio Secreto Vaticano*. The documents published by the Vatican Archivist consist mostly of eighteenth-century letters: two by Papebroch; several letters of Benedict XIV to the Bollandists; and correspondence of Cardinal Garampi and of Zondadari, nuncio to Brussels, concerning the Bollandists. In the second part of the volume Dr. Stephan Kuttner, who teaches the history of canon law in the School of Canon Law at the Catholic University of America, publishes a sixty-page study on *L'Edition Romaine des conciles généraux et les actes du premier concile de Lyon*. In his introductory pages he shows the importance of the Roman edition of the general councils, which appeared in 1608 ff., though it had been launched in the pontificate of Gregory XIII. He then limits himself to a study of how the Roman edition presented the General Council of Lyons in 1245. Later editors and historians have not sufficiently recognized their debt to this early edition. Mr. Kuttner shows superb control of the manuscripts of the texts pertaining to this council. He proves conclusively that there is need of a new edition of these texts.

Father Hubert Jedin, whose competence in the Tridentine field was established by his two volumes on Seripando, publishes his study, *Der Quellenapparat der Konzilsgeschichte Pallavicinos*, as Volume IV of the Miscellanea (Rome, 1940). He makes an investigation of the sources, printed and unprinted, which Pallavicino used for his *Istoria del concilio di Trento*. In the appendixes he lists and describes the *Tridentina* in the archives of the Gregorian University and publishes several of them, notably three letters of Cardinal Campeggio to Henry VIII.

The July-December, 1940, number of the *Miscellanea Francescana* (Vol. XL, Fasc. III-IV), which only recently arrived in America, is devoted to a long monograph entitled: *La casa dove nacque S. Francesco d'Assisi nella sua nuova documentazione storica*, by Giuseppe Abate, O.F.M.Conv. It assembles and focuses the historical proofs—notably archival documents—for the tradition that the chapel of S. Francesco Piccolo is the house where St. Francis was born and grew up. Besides a number of excellent plans and photographs, it gives the pertinent part of 206 documents, many of which are also reproduced in facsimile.

One of the few publications to reach us from the German-occupied parts of Europe is a slender volume of post-doctoral research by P. C. Boeren: *Contribution à l'histoire de Cambrai à l'époque mérovingienne* (Maestricht, Netherlands, Van Aelst Frères. May 30, 1940. Pp. 94). The author offers a critical study of the foundation charter of the Merovingian Abbey of Saint-Géry, which he discovered in the cathedral archives of Ghent. He begins with a masterly diplomatic study of the document. It was issued by a high Frankish aristocrat, Bernard, who can perhaps be identified with the mayor of the palace, Bernier or Bercher. The charter, preserved in a copy of the eleventh century, was issued 679-687. Its data afford the only information available on this abbey, which ceased to exist in Norman times. Its contents serve to correct errors concerning the early history of Cambrai handed down by later sources. Contrary to tradition, the Abbey of Saint-Géry was not the oldest of the region. Boeren believes that the abbey was a Benedictine foundation. He has a chapter on the cult of S. Géry, and another, extracting information from the charter, on the ownership of property in early Cambrai. He adds a note on the epic, *Raoul de Cambrai*. Throughout, his arguments are based on a deep knowledge of Merovingian institutions. In the transcription of line 7 of the charter there is a misprint, *obseqim* for *obsequium*, as is evident from the facsimile. On p. 44, *pous* should read *pour*.

The contents of the latest volume of the Catholic Record Society (*Registers of the Catholic Chapels Royal and of the Portuguese Embassy Chapel, 1662-1829*, Vol. I, *Marriages*, London, 1941) are of the nature of parochial marriage registers. When penal laws made parishes impossible London Catholics were largely dependent upon a few special chapels which were exempt from the law. These were meant to be for the private use of Catholic queens and foreign ambassadors, but usually the government winked at the fact that many English Catholics went to them for Mass and the sacraments; so the registers kept in them in part supply the place of parish records. The marriages here published were those recorded in the two Catholic chapels Charles II provided for his Portuguese queen, Catherine of Braganza, and those performed during the eighteenth century

in the Portuguese embassy. Besides a full index, there is a list of the priests known from these registers to have been in London.

After a brief interruption the *Round Table of Franciscan Research*, published by the Capuchin Friars of Marathon, Wisconsin, made its reappearance this summer in mimeographic form. The current number is a year-book (Volume VI, 1940-1941), but in the future the original plan will be resumed of publishing four issues during the scholastic year. The current volume completes the series of studies on the Observants. The Capuchins will be the subject of subsequent volumes. The following articles appear in Volume VI: "The Great Western Schism and the Franciscan Order" by Fr. Mel McCormack; "Decline and Attempts at Reform" by Fr. Leander Gribben; "Occam and Scotism in the 14th Century" by Fr. Malachy Flaherty; "Observants vs. Conventuals: 1430-1517" by Fr. Simon Hesse; "St. Bernardine of Siena" by Fr. Eric May; "St. John Capistran" by Fr. Roland Dusick; "James of the Marches and Albert of Sarteano" by Fr. Leander Gribben; "The Friars and 15th Century Humanism" by Fr. Fintan Spruck; "Minor Reforms in the 15th Century" by Fr. Mel McCormack, and a "Brief Survey of Scotism in the 15th Century" by Fr. Augustine Konzer. The articles are good enough to have deserved a less fanciful foreword. A typewriter equipped with the foreign-language accents should be employed for future issues. Communications may be addressed to: The Round Table, St. Anthony Friary, Marathon, Wisconsin.

A Second Spring (Marygrove College, Detroit, 1941. Pp. vi, 71) is an elegant reprint of the commencement number of the *Watch Tower*. It commemorates the golden jubilee of Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* with a sheaf of nineteen articles, largely historical in nature, by members of the senior and junior classes of Marygrove College. Eight of them deal with the teaching of the Church on labor in early Christian and mediaeval times. Seven deal with modern writers on labor, precursors of Leo XIII, in the various countries. The fact that Pope Leo synthesized the teaching of the Church on labor through the ages is demonstrated in a large folding chart which gives in parallel columns the antecedent Catholic thought on the chief points of the great encyclical. An article on *Quadragesimo Anno* and three on the influence of *Rerum Novarum* conclude the studies. All of them are documented and there are fourteen columns of bibliography at the end of the volume.

The project, like the similar one on the guilds emanating from Marygrove in 1940, was judiciously planned and gives evidence of careful direction. It shows to what heights the students of our colleges can rise when they are encouraged to occupy themselves with the great thought of their Catholic heritage.

Since it is not our practice to review dissertations published at the Catholic University of America, it will be useful to list here from time to time those that are of special interest to historians. Dissertations prepared in Departments other than that of History may easily escape the notice of our readers, though such studies may be largely historical in nature. The following is a partial list of those that have appeared in the last year: The Reverend Michael J. Curley, *Church and State in the Spanish Floridas, 1783-1822;* The Reverend Robert Gorman, *Catholic Apologetical Literature in the United States, 1784-1858;* Sister Letitia Mary Lyons, *Francis Norbert Blanchet and the Founding of the Oregon Missions;* The Reverend Leo F. Ruskowski, S.S., *French Emigré Priests in the United States, 1791-1815;* Sister Marie Léonore Fell, *The Foundations of Nativism in American Textbooks, 1783-1860;* The Reverend Robert Joseph Dwyer, *The Gentile Comes to Utah: A Study in Religious and Social Conflict (1862-1890);* Brother Joseph Brennan, F.S.C., *Social Conditions in Industrial Rhode Island, 1820-1860;* The Reverend George P. Jacoby, *Catholic Child Care in Nineteenth-Century New York: With a Correlated Summary of Public and Protestant Child Welfare;* The Reverend Edward J. Kiernan, C.M., *Arthur J. Penty: His Contribution to Social Thought;* The Reverend Daniel T. McColgan, *Joseph Tuckerman: Pioneer in American Social Work;* The Reverend Harold Francis Trehey, *Foundations of a Modern Guild System;* The Reverend Thomas A. Kelly, C.S.C., *Sancti Ambrosii liber de consolatione Valentiniani;* The Reverend José C. Pando, C.M., *The Life and Times of Synesius of Cyrene as Revealed in His Works;* Sister Patrick Jerome Mullins, O.P., *The Spiritual Life according to Saint Isidore of Seville;* Sister Marie Pierre Koch, R.S.M., *An Analysis of the Long Prayers in Old French Literature with Special Reference to the "Biblical-Creed-Narrative" Prayers;* The Reverend Joseph Anthony Hiller, C.PP.S., *Albrecht von Eyb: Medieval Moralist;* Brother Joel Stanislaus Nelson, F.S.C., *Aeneae Silvii de liberorum educatione: A Translation with an Introduction;* Sister Mary Lauretana Zanfagna, C.O.P., *Educational Theories and Principles of Cardinal Silvio Antoniano;* Sister M. Neomisia Rutkowska, C.S.F.N., *Bishop Adam Naruzewicz and His History of the Polish Nation: A Critical Analysis.*

The following dissertations in canon law have historical introductions: The Reverend Thomas Anglin, *The Eucharistic Fast;* The Reverend John Aloysius Goodwine, *The Right of the Church to Acquire Property;* The Reverend Edward Louis Heston, C.S.C., *The Alienation of Church Property in the United States;* and The Reverend Charles Augustine Kerin, S.S., *The Privation of Christian Burial.*

All these volumes are available at The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D. C. Many dissertations were still in press as the above list was drawn up. They will be mentioned in a later issue.

Dr. John J. Meng, one of the advisory editors of the REVIEW, has been elected chairman of the Department of Political Science at Queens College, Flushing, New York.

Sister M. Ambrose Mulholland, B.V.M., Ph.D., head of the history department at Clarke College, has been appointed president of that college. Her dissertation, *Early Gild Records of Toulouse*, was published this year by the Columbia University Press.

The Very Reverend Claude L. Vogel, O.F.M.Cap,. Ph.D., superior of Capuchin College at the Catholic University of America, has been chosen provincial of the Capuchin Province of St. Augustine. Father Vogel's dissertation, published at the Catholic University of America in 1928, was entitled: *Capuchins in French Louisiana (1722-1766)*. He is the editor of the annual *Report* of the Franciscan Educational Conference.

Dr. Manoel S. Cardozo, secretary of the Lima Library at the Catholic University of America, spent the summer doing historical research in the archives at various places in Brazil.

The Reverend Charles H. Lynch, Ph.D., has revised his study on *Saint Braulio, Bishop of Saragossa* (The Catholic University of America Press, 1938) in preparation for a Spanish translation which is being made of it in Madrid.

The first number (January, 1941) of *Filosofia y Letras*, published at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico, has one historical article: "Introducción al estudio de Bernal Díaz del Castillo y de su Verdadera Historia", by Ramón Iglesia. The article will form part of the author's work on the historians of New Spain. The April number has a contribution from the distinguished Spanish palaeographer, Agustín Millares Carlo: "El siglo XVIII español y las colecciones diplomáticas". One notes that both articles are historiographical in nature. The new periodical has three sections: philosophy, letters, and history and anthropology. Each section is followed by a few book reviews. A *Registro bibliográfico*, prepared by Professor Millares Carlo, forms a supplement to the first volume. It lists 1197 titles of books and articles, most of them in Spanish. The annual subscription for the quarterly is $2.00 (Ribera de San Cosme 71, Mexico, D. F.).

La Voz Guadalupana (Revista mexicana de cultura publicada por la Basílica de Santa María de Guadalupe) is in its eighth year of publication. Many of its brief articles are historical in nature. The subscription price is $1.00 a year.

The July number of *Unitas* is devoted to Father Evergisto Bazaco's study: *La primera universidad de Orient, breve reseña documentada de la*

Real y Pontificia Universidad de Santo Tomas, Manila. Father Bazaco's volumes on the *History of Education in the Philippines* (1934) are already well known. This new little work on the history of the University of St. Thomas from its beginnings in the early seventeenth century to the present is very welcome. It can be obtained from the University of Manila Press.

The July number of *Speculum* contains *in memoriam* notices of several distinguished mediaevalists: George Livingstone Hamilton, Alfons Hilka, John Matthews Manly, Eileen Power, and Rudolf Thurneysen.

Obituary notices of Isobel D. Thornley, David S. Schaff, Worthington C. Ford, Henry Osborn Taylor, Ramsay Muir, Preserved Smith, Werner Sombart, Erik McKinley Eriksson, and Gilbert Benjamin appear in the July number of the *American Historical Review.*

With the death of Father Paul Walsh, Ireland has lost one of its best historical scholars. He is very familiar to those interested in Irish history as the author of books and articles. At the time of his death he was preparing an edition of the *Annals of the Four Masters.*

A Solemn Pontifical Field Mass celebrated on July 29 by the Most Reverend Francis J. Magner, Bishop of Marquette, marked the tercentennial of the coming of the Jesuit missionary, St. Isaac Jogues, to Sault Ste. Marie and the planting of the first Cross in the Northwest Territory.

The bicentennial celebration of the Reverend Anthony Foucher was held at the Purdue University Field House, West Lafayette, Indiana, under the auspices of the Lafayette Deanery Union of the Holy Name Societies on Sunday, June 29. The printed program of the occasion contains an article by the Reverend Joseph A. Klinker entitled "God's Pioneer, the Life and Times of Anthony Foucher, First Native Blackrobe of the Middle West." The article contains several documents from the archives of the archbishopric of Quebec. Father Foucher was the first person born west of the Alleghenies to be ordained a priest. Born at Fort Ouiatenon, the present site of West Lafayette, he was ordained in Canada and spent the thirty-eight years of his priestly life there.

The "Centenary of Catholicity in Montana" was celebrated during the last week of August. The original Saint Mary's Mission was founded by Father Peter DeSmet among the Flathead Indians in the Bitter Root Valley in 1841. The story has been dramatically told by Helene Magaret in her recent fictionized biography of DeSmet. For the celebration Patricia Corley prepared an illustrated booklet, *The Story of St. Mary's Mission.*

Besides the Most Reverend Joseph M. Gilmore, Bishop of Helena, other members of the hierarchy, including the Apostolic Delegate, the Most Reverend Amleto G. Cicognani, took part in the festivities held in Helena,

Stevensville, and Butte. In connection with the centenary Bishop Gilmore has done considerable active research on his own account. He has been aided and supported by an enthusiastic corps of scholars among his clergy.

1941 marks the centenary of the founding of St. Paul and the building of the first church in that city. Father Lucien Galtier, a native of France, whose missionary activity covered the region along the upper Mississippi, named the city of St. Paul and built the church. On August 13 a pilgrimage, headed by his Excellency, Archbishop John Gregory Murray, and Mayor McDonough, brought seventy-five leading citizens to Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, where Father Galtier had spent his last years as pastor of St. Gabriel's Church. They placed a wreath on the tomb of the founder with appropriate speech-making. It was essentially a civic affair, ending with a testimonial dinner tendered by the rector of Campion Academy, the Reverend William S. Bowdern, S.J.

A profusely illustrated centennial history by Sister Mary Carmelite Brungs, S.N.D. was published to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of the Church of the Mother of God in Covington, Kentucky. Besides an account of the brick-and-mortar activity of the pastors, it contains a detailed history of the choirs and the music produced by them since the founding of the church. The celebration was held on May 11, 1941. The present pastor is the Reverend Edward G. Klosterman.

June of this year marked the centenary of the ordination of St. John Bosco. His first boys' patronage was founded in December, 1841.

Fordham University closed the observance of its centenary with three days of ceremonies, September 15-17.

This year marks the centenary of the so-called Negro Plot in New York City. The June number of the *Catholic Digest* contains an account of it condensed from an article by Ethel King in *Historical Records and Studies* (1931) of the U. S. Catholic Historical Society.

The Sisters of Divine Providence at San Antonio are observing the seventy-fifth anniversary of their establishment in this country.

July 10 marked the fiftieth anniversary of the approval of the constitutions of the Society of Mary by Pope Leo XIII. The congregation was founded in 1817 by Canon William Joseph Chaminade at Bordeaux.

The Very Reverend Victor Francis O'Daniel, O.P., celebrated his golden jubilee in the priesthood on June 16. The sermon, by Monsignor Peter Guilday, was a summarization of the celebrant's outstanding activities. Father O'Daniel was one of the co-founders of the *Catholic Historical*

Review and served on the board of editors for a number of years. He is also a charter member of the American Catholic Historical Association. His many writings deal for the most part with the history of the Dominicans in this country. At present, he is writing a history of the Province of St. Joseph, of which he has long been the archivist.

On September 30, 1941, Father Francis S. Betten observed his diamond Jubilee as a Jesuit. Father Betten is a charter member of the American Catholic Historical Association. Through a quarter of a century he showed a keen interest in the growth of the Association, participated actively in programs and business meetings, and otherwise collaborated with Dr. Guilday. Father Betten has been relieved of his classroom duties, but still carries on his research. His published work includes several text books and a number of monographs and bibliographical studies, to which may be added his frequent scholarly contributions to learned reviews.

Documents: Simon Alcok on Expanding the Sermon [text of a fifteenth-century Latin Art of Preaching based on seven mss. and an incunabulum]. Mary Boynton (*Harvard Theol. Rev.*, July).—From the Archives: Holy Trinity Church, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1845. John B. Wuest, O.F.M. (*Provincial Chronicle*, Spring, 1941).—Informes acerca de las misiones de Lean y Mulia, de la Provincia de Honduras, Año de 1757. (*Boletín del Archivo General del Gobierno, Guatemala*, Jan.).—Testimonio de los títulos, Fe de Bautismo y demás documentos de la conversión del Caribe Carlos Matías Antonio Yarrinsen, Año de 1783. *(ibid.)*.—Autos acerca de la traslación de los indios Payas á la ciudad de Comayagua. Año de 1785. (*ibid.*).—Informe de la reducción de nueve indios Payas, Año de 1785. *(ibid.)*.—Informes de las misiones de los padres Franciscanos en el Oriente. Ed. by Carlos A. Vivanco (*Boletín de la Academia Nacional de Historia de Ecuador*, Jan.).

BRIEF NOTICES

CHARANIS, PETER. *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491-518.* [University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History, Number Twenty-Six] (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1939. Pp. 102. $1.50). Mr. Charanis finds that the central principle of the policy of Emperor Anastasius was this: "Of the two authorities, the ecclesiastical and the imperial, the former is subordinate to the latter, and the emperor, through whom the imperial authority finds expression, is empowered, by virtue of his efforts, to deal with the religious situation of the empire as he sees fit, irrespective of the wishes of the ecclesiastical officials or the edicts of the church" (pp. 56-57). He apparently approves of this policy and seems to think that religious unity at any price, even on a basis of error, is an ideal worthy of achievement (cf. e. g., p. 42). It does not seem to have entered his mind that the papacy was sincerely and primarily interested in the true doctrine. He is not at home speaking of religious matters. "Rome should ever be the prelate of the universal Church," is his rendering of the passive participle of *praeferre* (p. 22); bishopric is used for episcopate (p. 24); he says, "Symmachus was ordained pope" (p. 24, n. 65; see also his strange conclusion to the same note). Much more serious is his mistranslation of the famous passage of Pope Gelasius: "...in quibus tanto grauius pondus est sacerdotum quanto etiam pro ipsis regibus hominum in diuino reddituri sunt examine rationem." In citing he breaks off the quotation with *sacerdotum* and he translates: "Of these the authority of the priest is much the greater" (p. 22). On the same page he adapts a well known passage of the Carlyles to his own purpose.

He grasps at straws to prove that Anastasius did not permit his Monphysitic views to determine his religious policy. He comes to this conclusion on p. 13: "If in his official capacity he [Anastasius] tended to support the Monophysites, it may have been less because of his personal convictions than because of the religious situation in the empire. It was the religious problem, not his personal convictions, that determined his policy throughout his reign." (ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER)

CLOUGH, SHEPARD BANCROFT, and CHARLES WOOLSEY COLE. *Economic History of Europe.* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Co. 1941. Pp. xx, 841. $4.00.) This textbook is a most welcome addition to the very limited and inadequate list of texts covering the whole field of European economic history. Only ninety-eight pages are devoted to the Middle Ages and the beginnings of capitalism before 1500, but this summary is excellent. A possible criticism is that the authors have failed to emphasize the economic and social significance of that large class of workers in the mediaeval towns called the "mediaeval proletariat" by Professor Pirenne. They mention this class but underestimate its size and importance.

There is nothing revolutionary in the author's treatment of the rise of capitalism, but their summary is based on the works of the best historians and their analysis is extremely shrewd. They present the facts and allow the student or teacher to draw his own conclusions. They are convinced that for capitalism to survive it must continually expand. They would agree with Professor Schumpeter that a static capitalism is a contradiction in terms.

The analysis by Clough and Cole of the economic effects of the First World War should be read by all those interested in the economic effects of the present conflict. They show clearly that the trend toward autarchy and state capitalism has deep economic causes apart from extreme nationalism.

This work is a model of what a textbook should be—a really useful index, an adequate reading list after each chapter, and a style of writing that is easily comprehensible. (WALTER JOHN MARX)

COLLINS, JOSEPH B., S.S., D.D., PH.D. *Christian Mysticism in the Elizabethan Age, with its Background in Mystical Methodology.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1940. Pp. xiv, 251. $3.25.) *Christian Mysticism in the Elizabethan Age* sheds needed light, not only on one of the prominent strands of Renaissance thought, but on the nature of mysticism itself. The publication of this carefully documented treatise should do much to dispel the confusion reigning in discussions of the subject. It should also serve as a basis for the study of mysticism itself.

Besides charting the field of mysticism as it manifested itself in England during the Renaissance, Father Collins' learned work brings together for the first time in brief compass an historical analysis of the specific method of Christian mysticism from its beginnings in Plato to its golden age in the late mediaeval period. Such a presentation provides an excellent background not only for his own research in Elizabethan literature, but for similar historical treatises on mysticism and studies of the mystical manifestations in literature.

An enumeration of the headings of the three parts forming this work will perhaps best reveal the richness of its content. Part I is entitled "The Method of Mysticism", and, as the title implies, is an analysis of the stages of mystical experience found in the writings of Plato, the Neoplatonists, St. Paul, St. Augustine, Pseudo-Dionysius, St. Gregory, St. Bernard, Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, St. Francis of Assisi, and St. Bonaventure. Since the description of these stages is based upon the writings of recognized exponents of this method of ascending to God, it follows that, besides tracing its development and describing its method, the author presents what is too rare in treatises on the subject—a clear notion of what mysticism is. Part I therefore will bring order and clarity into all future discussions of the subject.

Part II is a more specialized treatise, inasmuch as it analyzes the "Mystical Literature of Foreign Origin in the Elizabethan Age", such as that of Boethius and Dante. And Part III is a study of the "Christian Mysticism in Native [English] Writers", such as Robert Southwell and Edmund Spenser.

In spite of the impression its title gives, this work is of importance, not only to students of literature, but to all interested in either the theory or practice of asceticism. Besides being of importance therefore to seminarians and priests and the religious-minded in general, it will prove highly informa-

tive and instructive to religious; for their mode of life is essentially based on the method of ascent to God analyzed in these pages. In a sense it is a handbook to the literature on mysticism, to sainthood, and to an understanding of those poets whose song was inspired by yearnings for the "vision splendid". (VIRGIL R. STALLBAUMER)

COTTERILL, R. S. *A Short History of the Americas.* (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc. 1939. Pp. xv, 459. $2.50.) The attempt to place our national history in its American setting, using "American" in a continental sense, is a laudable but almost impossible goal to attain within the compass of one volume, particularly a volume of the dimensions of the present one. Nevertheless, the author deserves commendation for the measure of success with which he has acquitted himself of this herculean task. In twenty-three chapters he has crammed the history of the New World from the earliest fabled explorations of the Norsemen to the present. It is inevitable that the narrative should be sketchy in places and that at times it should descend to a mere enumeration of names, dates, and events.

Among some notable omissions may be mentioned the Álvarez de Pineda expedition of 1519 that traced the gulf coast from Apalacha to Veracruz and which drew the first detailed map of the entire coast of the Gulf of Mexico. This achievement is a first in American history that cannot be ignored. The Mendoza expedition of 1683-84, which penetrated Texas near Presidio and established a temporary mission in west Texas near San Angelo, deserves, likewise, a passing mention. The statement that in eastern Mexico "not even an exploring expedition crossed the Rio Grande until 1665", is too sweeping a generalization, for in 1650 Hernán Martín and Diego del Castillo crossed the Rio Grande into Texas and penetrated to a river which they called the Nueces (now the Concho) and they visited the confines of the Tejas Indian territory. Again in 1654 Diego de Guadalajara crossed the Rio Grande and visited the Jumano pueblos on the Concho River.

The chapter on British and Spanish colonial America is worthy of particular commendation. The impartial and judicial appraisal of the respective colonial empires and their cultural values is on the whole a fair estimate and a careful analysis of the fundamental differences in character and background of the two great colonizers of the New World. The book is too brief, however, for an adequate presentation of a subject so vast. It is at best a brave and not altogether unhappy attempt to give a sweeping vista of four centuries of history in the New World. (CARLOS E. CASTAÑEDA)

FRITZ, PERCY STANLEY. *Colorado: The Centennial State.* (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc. 1941. Pp. xii, 518. $3.75.) Dr. Fritz, assistant professor of history in the University of Colorado, has given us a volume primarily intended as a college text on the history of Colorado, which will prove to be inviting not only to the college student but to the general reader as well. It is a complete survey of this territory from the period it was inhabited by cliff dwellers to the present time. After a geographic description of the state and a rather dull and disjointed account of the native Indians and the Spanish and French explorations, the book becomes increasingly interesting and lively as the author unfolds the activities of the early fur trappers and

traders, the Pike's Peak gold rush, the Indian troubles, the problems of the open range, conservation and reclamation projects, and the industrial development, ending even with a discussion and evaluation of current problems confronting the state.

Political history finds its way into the volume rather unobtrusively, and only in so far as it is necessary to bring out the economic, social, and cultural development. The history of both the territory and state is very effectively interwoven with the history of the United States, as each felt the influence and impact of the other. Part II, dealing with the Pioneer Period, 1858-61, will appeal particularly to one who knows little of the trials and difficulties of those who sought their livelihood in the mining camps of the West. Mining methods, regulations, and the laws are explained with a clearness hardly to be found in any similar work. So too in the chapter on conservation and reclamation the struggle of Colorado, holding to the doctrine of appropriation regarding the use of water, with other states adopting the doctrine of riparian rights, is told in a simple and convincing manner.

Although specifically dealing with Colorado, the text could serve as a fine introduction to the history of the West, particularly where mining, cattle-raising, and agriculture predominate. One has no trouble in discerning that the author admires Colorado and loves the West; still his treatment on the whole is eminently fair and unbiased, as witness his discussion of "The Sand Creek Affair" (pp. 205-209).

The volume is attractively printed, is copiously sprinkled with illustrations, has a good map of the state, and a rather complete selective bibliography at the end of each chapter. It also has an excellent index, together with an appendix listing the territorial governors and the senators, representatives, and governors of the state. (JAMES W. MCCORMICK)

GALDAMES, LUIS. *A History of Chile.* Translated and Edited by Isaac Joslin Cox. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1941. Pp. xii, 565. $5.00.) The University of North Carolina Press must be warmly congratulated on the success of its Inter-American Historical Series. Launched four years ago, the series was to consist "of the translation into English of that volume for each country of Hispanic America, written in each case preferably by a national of the respective country, and which would have the approval of the higher institutions of learning and of reputable scholars." Four volumes have already appeared. The first one, published in 1937, was devoted to Argentina; the second, to Brazil; the third, to Colombia; and the present one, to Chile. Announced for future publication are books on Mexico, Peru, and Bolivia, and a general history of Latin America. The Inter-American Historical Series is, therefore, an ambitious undertaking; and it is indeed fortunate that the intelligent layman, without a knowledge either of Spanish or of Portuguese, can now be provided with something more solid than the usual American textbooks of Latin American history.

In so far as Señor Galdames' books is concerned, what has been said of the first three volumes in the series may be repeated now: it fills a long-felt need. For purposes of classroom instruction, teachers will find it

extremely useful. Outside of the classroom, students of Latin American affairs will want to dip into it for a more detailed treatment of Chile's past. It is hardly necessary to dwell at length on a book which, since its publication in 1906, has gone through many editions. The *Estudio de la Historia de Chile* is today accepted in Chile as a standard work for students and the general public; in the United States, in its English form, the book will naturally occupy the same position.

A number of points of view and minor inaccuracies may well be noted. Some readers will remark that the colonial period of Chilean history is treated with less kindness than it might have merited. Other readers will find something to cavil at the author's account of Portales. Again, a number of oversights, which may indicate the translator's lack of familiarity with Portuguese, should be pointed out: 'Bartolomé Díaz" (p. 20), "Puerto Santo" (p. 21), and "Joaquín Nabuco" (p. 508). These observations will not affect in any appreciable way the general excellence of the work; and the volume will be received by American students as a distinct contribution to the historical literature, in English, on Chile.

This review should not be brought to a close without a word of praise to Professor Cox of Northwestern University, who translated and edited the book. His English rendering is good and his notes useful. He deserves our gratitude for having sacrificed much time in completing a task which is often a thankless one. (MANOEL S. CARDOZO)

GHELLINCK, J. DE, S.J. *Littérature latine au moyen âge.* Vol. I, *Depuis les origines jusqu'à la fin de la renaissance carolingienne*; Vol. II, *De la renaissance carolingienne à saint Anselme.* [Bibliothèque catholique des sciences religieuses] (Paris: Bloud & Gay. 1939. Pp. 191; 192. 15 francs per volume.) Anyone who has followed Père de Ghellinck's numerous penetrating reviews in the *Nouvelle revue théologique* and elsewhere will realize how eminently fitted he is to write a survey of mediaeval Latin literature. In the rigorously limited compass imposed upon him by the series in which the volumes appear he has succeeded in giving not a dry catalogue of authors and works but a real appreciation of their importance and contribution. His method of grouping the authors, while necessarily very flexible, will do much to save the reader from confusion. It is unfortunate that such distinguished work cannot be published more sumptuously with benefit of notes and an index. Readers will hope that the third, and perhaps fourth, volume will not fail to appear. (ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER)

HUME, EDGAR ERSKINE (Ed.). *General Washington's Correspondence concerning the Society of the Cincinnati.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1941. Pp. xliv, 472. $4.50.) A sketch of the Society of the Cincinnati with emphasis on its origin and the opposition encountered introduces this volume. Current activities are then outlined, officers are listed, and the constitution is presented. The main part of the book—nearly four-fifths of the whole—is given over to the correspondence of Washington from 1783 to 1798. There are letters to prospective members, letters to heads of chapters, to leaders in political and military life in America and France. Throughout much thought is given to the defense of the new organization against attacks

launched at home and abroad. Both the number and the content of these letters prove that Washington was not satisfied with being a mere figurehead as president of the Society. The value of this collection of letters is enhanced by the fact that some of them are not found in Sparks, or in Ford or Fitzgerald. To aid in understanding the letters addressed to Frenchmen thumbnail biographies of these gentlemen are offered. Lieutenant Colonel Hume, assistant secretary-general since 1932, is the author of many books and articles on the Society. In this volume he has made scholars indebted to him for a reference work which gives a better understanding of Washington and early American history. (CHARLES H. METZGER)

KIRKLAND, EDWARDS C. *A History of American Economic Life.* Revised edition. (New York: F. S. Crofts & Co. 1939. Pp. xv, 810. $3.75.) College textbooks in economic history usually make dull reading but this one by Professor Kirkland is an exception. With excellent narrative sense and admirable historical detachment, he presents the story of America's economic growth colorfully and dramatically. The book begins with an account of the aggressive creation of overseas empire in the early part of the seventeenth century and ends with an appraisal of New Deal policies as of 1939.

In analysing controversial issues relating to such matters as slavery, labor relations, or New Deal policies, the author carefully avoids sweeping interpretations. For instance, while the significance of the frontier is briefly discussed, it is not offered as an exclusive explanation. Instead, the opening of the West is treated as a succession of stages in the development of American agriculture and industrial localization. In fact, it would be difficult to point to any basic thesis in this work aside from the dominant economic theme which is developed in an eclectic manner.

To students interested in the Catholic activities in our American economic history, the book may prove disappointing. There are very few references to the Church. In the first chapter called "The Imperial Frontier", the author explains briefly that the enslavement of the Indian population aroused the denunciation of the Church since it hampered the work of conversion. Further, Cardinal Richelieu and Charles Carroll receive brief mention, but little else appears concerning Catholic activities or leaders. (FRANK LEWAND)

KOONTZ, LOUIS KNOTT. *Robert Dinwiddie, his Career in American Colonial Government and Westward Expansion.* (Glendale, California: Arthur H. Clark Co. 1941. Pp. 430. $6.00.) Robert Dinwiddie, lieutenant-governor of Virginia 1751-1758, has at last met his biographer in the person of Professor Koontz, who combines the editorship of the *Pacific Historical Review* and a post in the University of California at Los Angeles. The author is an authority on the Virginia frontier and is well-qualified to do this job, since most of Dinwiddie's problems derived in one way or another from that frontier. The Scottish Dinwiddie was successively merchant, Bermuda official, custom surveyor for the southern district of America, inspector-general of custom, and lieutenant-governor of Virginia under two non-resident governors, Lords Albemarle and Loudoun. Despite the judgments of earlier historians to the contrary, he was an able and intelligent steward during a very difficult period of Anglo-French rivalry, according to

the evidence presented by Mr. Koontz. The study also narrates well the education of George Washington in the school of the soldier, and credits Dinwiddie with recognizing merit in Washington and giving him a chance to develop himself; hence the title conferred upon the lieutenant-governor in the last words of the book: "Grandfather of his Country" (p. 403).

It is doubtful whether the style will attract nonprofessional readers; therefore it would probably be better to allow readers to draw the more obvious inferences for themselves. It is rather trying to have every quotation explained and fully commented upon. But the merits of the book outweigh this mild annoyance. The author has apparently omitted nothing of importance. He has made lavish use of quotable passages from the documents, and he has organized the whole very well. Probably no more complete life of Dinwiddie ever can or need be written. To the student of the thirteen colonies as a whole this book will be valuable for its detailed account of the difficulties met by one governor who wanted inter-colonial co-operation in matters concerning all of them.

To this reader—after two years of residence in Greater Boston—no better proof of Washington's greatness has been offered than the statement that the young Virginia soldier visited Boston for ten days in 1756 and thereby "came to understand the New Englanders" (p. 350). (MARSHALL SMELSER)

MOURRET, FERNAND. *A History of the Catholic Church,* Volume IV. *Period of the Later Middle Ages* (translated by Newton Thompson, S.T.B. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1941. Pp. x, 740. $4.00.) This translation of Volume IV of Mourret's *Histoire de l'Église* (1921) has been preceded by similar translations of Volumes V (1930), I (1931), II (1935), III (1936). As in the case of the previous volumes, Father Thompson has simply presented a translation with no comments or corrections of his own, thereby making available to English readers a well known and important work. The period covered by this volume (962-1294) is divided into three parts: (1) The Imperial Protectorate; (2) the Liberation of the Church, and (3) the Organization of Christendom. In place of the topical and critical bibliography of the original French edition, the translator has prepared a partial alphabetical list of works cited in the notes. To these he has added "a few titles." Since the list is admittedly not exhaustive, it is difficult to criticize. But it is perhaps justifiable to regret the omission of such works as those of Fliche and Arquillière on the Gregorian era, Guiraud on the Inquisition, and Volume VI of Dufourcq, *L'Avenir du Christianisme,* which covers the same period as the volume under review and contains excellent critical bibliographies and notes. A number of works are not cited in their most recent edition. (MARSHALL W. BALDWIN)

NIEMEYER, GERHART. *Law Without Force. The Function of Politics in International Law.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1941. Pp. xiv, 408. $3.75.) In this era of social revolution and world destruction a query which is perennially submitted in the realm of academic discussion is: What kind of civilization will survive? Students of political affairs are conscious of factual evidence indicating a fundamental modification in the basic elements

of our contemporary civilization. This treatise on international affairs serves as an additional reminder of this avowed fact.

The procedure followed by the author is well taken. As suggested by his prefatory remarks, Mr. Niemeyer outlines a hypothesis and attempts to prove a thesis. The hypothesis applies not only to "international law but also to the entire problem of legal order in the present epoch." Accordingly, there is accepted the fundamental principle that law is concerned only with relationships, and not with separate individuals or groups of individuals. Consequently it is the functional approach of international law and political principles which motivates the treatment. This inevitably produces the thesis, which is to be proved: *Political reality has become unlawful, because the existing system of international law has become unreal.*

Here then is a practical challenge. The reader is familiarized with developments as they are at present and consequences which have already shaped themselves. Continually it must be remembered that a return to the acceptance of moral principles in the functioning of international affairs is basically sound. Traditionally speaking, international law depends for its effectiveness, almost entirely upon the element of obligation, or moral appeal. There is no escape from this fundamental principle. (HAROLD F. HARTMAN)

POTOCEK, CYRIL J. *Cyril and Methodus: Apostles of the Slavs.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons. 1941. Pp. 172. $2.00.) One greets with joy the appearance of this valuable contribution to the ecclesiastical history of the Slavs in the English language. It was a happy idea to start with the missionary work of these "first teachers and enlighteners of the Slavs, SS. Cyril and Methodius".

The author rightly approaches the subject by introducing the reader to the earliest history, civilization, character, and status of the Slavs in the ninth century, in which he epitomizes the fruits of the latest studies on the subject. Having prepared the reader with this background, he presents the lives of the two missionary brothers and continues with a brief narration of the vicissitudes of their double heritage, Slavonic language and Catholic faith, in the succeeding centuries. Several liturgical texts are given in the appendices, which give a clearer insight into the Slavic liturgy.

The book does not appear to have scientific pretensions, which would hardly have been possible in its limited form. It aims to give information in a succinct way on the essential points in the christianization of the Slavs in the ninth century and perhaps to excite further inquiry into Slavic history. Its primary value lies in the fact that it is a contribution to Slavic history in the English language. It is attractively written and rich with information for the English reader, and as such it is to be recommended. There is, in addition to the vast literature on SS. Cyril and Methodius in other languages, still need for a scientific work on these saints in English, either in the form of a translation or as an original work. (VLADIMIR VANCIK)

ROBERT, JOSEPH CLARKE. *The Road from Monticello: A Study of the Virginia Slavery Debate of 1832.* [Historical Papers of Trinity College Historical Society, Series XXIV.] (Durham: Duke University Press. 1941.

Pp. vii, 127. $1.00.) This monograph is a worthy contribution to the scholarly papers of the Trinity College Historical Society. As the subtitle indicates, it offers not only a detailed analysis of an important phase of the slavery controversy in Virginia; it also takes its place in the steadily lengthening list of studies on the social and intellectual life of the South. For the author sees in the Virginia debate an epitome of the national conflict; of the clash between East and West; and, in a broader sense, the "perpetual struggle between the radical, crying for experiment, and the conservative, championing the *status quo*" (pp. v-vi)—the sort of conflict, in fact, that is dividing the nation today.

The debate in question grew out of recommendations made by Governor Floyd of Virginia to the General Assembly which met at Richmond in the December following the Nat Turner insurrection. The intervening months had witnessed the growth of a public opinion that called for measures that would forestall a future revolt. The governor's recommendations, together with resolutions on the same subject, offered from the floor of the house, were referred to a select committee. The debate, which lasted two weeks, was precipitated by the offering of two motions, one of which would restrain the committee from considering abolition, while the other would compel it to entertain a specific plan for emancipation.

Professor Robert traces the course of the debate, analyzing its various factors, evaluating sectional influences, classifying arguments, and showing clearly the trend from the liberalism of Jefferson to the intolerance of Calhoun. The reaction of the Virginia controversy upon other slave-holding states, and the development of conservative thought into a "philosophy of defense" intolerant of criticism, are treated in subsequent chapters.

To the reviewer, the most interesting portion of the study are the fifty-six pages devoted to extracts from the debate. Indeed, so absorbing are they, so human, so frankly self-revealing, so characteristic of the southern oratory of the day, that one could well wish that they had been lengthier, if not complete. They furnish flesh, blood, and sinew to the skeleton of the first half of the monograph, admirably constructed though it be. Three appendices classify the delegates with their votes and their slave-holdings. There is an adequate index, but no bibliography. The footnotes, however, are very full and attest Professor Robert's use of manuscript and printed sources, as well as his acquaintance with the best secondary authorities. (Sister M. Augustina Ray)

Sforza, Count Carlo. *Fifty Years of War and Diplomacy in the Balkans: Pashich and the Union of the Yugoslavs.* Translated by J. G. Clemenceau LeClercq. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1940. Pp. x, 195. $2.75.) This volume might have unusual interest at this time. Nicholas Pashich was premier of Serbia during the Balkan Wars, at the time of the Sarajevo assassination, and through the World War, representative of the South Slavs at the Paris Peace Conference, and first premier of a united Yugoslavia. Count Carlo Sforza, Italian diplomatist of the pre-Fascist era, enjoyed a lengthy, intimate association with Pashich. Unfortunately, the book is disappointing. It leaves untouched large portions of Paschich's career

and treats only certain phases of the Yugoslav movement. It is an uncritical, laudatory account of a friendship, not a discriminating, judicial evaluation of a statesman or a movement.

The steadfast faith of Pashich in the future of the Serbs stands out. The stimulation of Serbian nationalism by the Austrian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908 is clearly shown. So also is the conflict in Austro-Hungarian circles between the anti-nationalistic, anti-Slav conservatism of the group around the Emperor Francis Joseph, and the ideals of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand who desired to create a tripartite monarchy, by admitting the Slavs of the empire to equality with the Germans and Magyars.

But Count Sforza leaves important problems unanswered. Pashich openly feared that the tripartite scheme of Franz Ferdinand would mollify the Slavic elements in the empire and thus weaken the Pan-Serb agitation. It is highly disappointing, then, to have Count Sforza say blandly that writers raising the question of Pashich's relation to the Sarajevo assassination "succeed merely in proving what hatred the World War left in its wake." The role of Pashich at the Paris conference, too, is scarcely touched. Only once is there implied criticism of Pashich. Although realizing that the "widely different historical background of Croats and Serbs would make a common norm of administration difficult," Pashich, in 1921, "imposed on the Yugoslav State a constitution with extreme centralization as its essential principle" (and Serbian domination over the Croats as a result). Events of 1941 give point to this criticism.

All in all, Count Sforza has written a readable volume, but one which fails to answer several of the questions it raises, and fails even to raise others. (FRANCIS A. ARLINGHAUS)

SPECTOR, MARGARET MARION, Ph.D. *The American Department of the British Government, 1768-1782.* [Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, No. 466.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1940. Pp. 181. $2.25.) This monograph does not pretend to be another history of British colonial policy; as the Preface states it "is a study of the origin, organization, and functioning of the department which, from 1768 to 1782, was responsible for the administration of the colonies and which was largely responsible for the conduct of the American war." As it turned out, this responsibility was never fully converted into action. The chapters deal with the origin, organization, and personnel of the department, the feud with the older secretaries in the Northern and Southern Departments, relations with other departments, biographical sketches of the under-secretaries, the Colonial Office correspondence, and the abolition of the department. Emphasis is placed on the part played by the under-secretaries and in particular by John Pownall and William Knox whose work has not heretofore received adequate attention.

The need of a distinct colonial department had long been voiced by many, including Governor Pownall formerly of Massachusetts Bay, but politics and jealousies delayed its establishment until it was clear that such a step would consolidate the influence of the king. The chief source of controversy with the older departments was the claim of the Colonial Secretary to the right of giving orders to the Admiralty and War Office, particularly with respect

to the transportation of troops to and from the colonies. A compromise resulted which worked rather badly until, at the outbreak of the American war, the prestige of the new department increased considerably. Even then the inefficient management of the other departments interfered with its work. After the failure of the war, Whig opposition brought about the abolition of the office. It was created to strengthen the royal control; its demise was due in large measure to opposition to the king's system.

This study was well worth the making. It is more valuable for its careful presentation of the history of the organization and activities of the department than for its more incidental account of British-American policy during this period. It is the former purpose, however, which the author had in mind. (Leo F. Stock)

Winslow, Ola Elizabeth. *Jonathan Edwards, 1703-1758, A Biography.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1940. Pp. xii, 406. $3.50.) The life story of Jonathan Edwards is here told with as much detail and completeness as the case permits. The biography is divided into three books, of which the first tells of Edward's ancestry, his childhood, and his education at Yale. The second book, entitled "Success and Failure" gives an account of the subject's years of ministry at Northampton. Not only does it offer an account of Jonathan Edwards and his work as minister, but it provides as well a picture of some of the most striking aspects of the religious life of the American colonies at that time. It was an age of revivalism, of George Whitefield and his associates and supporters. Edwards' own part in this movement and the character and content of his preaching are most interestingly set forth. The account of his troubles as a minister and of his final loss of the Northampton parish adds to the importance and value of this section of Miss Winslow's work. The last and shortest of the three books tells of the last years, during which Edwards served as minister at Stockbridge, wrote his most important works, and served briefly as president of Princeton.

The author's purpose has been to give an account of the life of Jonathan Edwards rather than an account of his thought. Yet it would seem that the nature of her subject demands that a larger place be given to an exposition of his theology than has here been allotted. Both the thinker and the man must be considered, particularly where the title "great" is in question. It is a title that must be used with reserve. In the case of Jonathan Edwards it is the thinker rather than the man to whom primary consideration must be given when there is judgment as to greatness. In an epilogue, Miss Winslow considers the question: what is his greatness? Her final answer is that "the conclusion persists that as a shaping force in American culture, the man himself has been more important than anything he ever did or said or wrote."

In this rather lyrically written biography the author shows herself to be completely devoted to her subject. Her work is carefully documented and contains an extensive bibliography. The present reviewer has noticed but one minor misprint (p. 152). (John K. Ryan)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

Il discorso di Pio XII agli universitari e ai laureati, breviario spirituale per gli uomini di studio. Agostino Gemelli (*Vita e Pensiero*, May, 1941).

Il cinquantesimo anniversario della "Rerum Novarum". Francesco Vito (*ibid.*).

Rerum Novarum, 1891-1941. Lewis Watt (*Month*, May-June).

Esame critico della dottrina de A. Rosmini circa il concetto di storia. A. M. Bianchi (*Divus Thomas*, Piacenza, May, 1941).

Il concetto di storia in Antonio Rosmini. *Idem* (*ibid.*, Jan., 1941).

Movimento ecumenico protestante. C. Crivelli, S.I. (*Civiltà cattolica*, Mar. 1941).

La cultura normanno-sveva. M. Scaduto, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Il buono e il cattivo in un recente volume di Benedetto Croce. D. Mondrone, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Should the Historian Study Psychology? Lewis M. Terman (*Pacific Historical Review*, June).

The Social Sciences in the Post-War World: A Symposium (*Canadian Hist. Rev.*, June).

Cartography—The Stepchild of History. Hazel Shields Garrison (*Pennsylvania Hist.*, July).

The Contributions of Geography to the Social Studies. Preston E. James (*Social Education*, May).

Historian's Consolation in Philosophy. Rushton Coulborn (*Southern Review*, Summer, 1941).

The Great Man in History [Carlyle]. Paul F. Bloomhardt (*Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, July-Sept.).

The Theory of Democracy. Mortimer J. Adler and Walter Farrell, O.P. (*Thomist*, July).

Christianity and Culture. Christopher Dawson (*Dublin Review*, Apr.).

Russian and German Nihilism. Hermann Rauschning (*ibid.*).

Nietzsche and National Socialism. Frederick Copleston (*ibid.*).

Civilization at the Crossroads: I. The Rise of Industrialism, II. The Material Crisis. John U. Nef (*Review of Politics*, July).

Perversions of Values: Reflections on some Ideologies of To-day and Yesterday. J. M. O'Sullivan (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Mar., Apr., and May).

The Protestant Church and Reunion. G. Mitchell (*ibid.*, Apr.).

Pope Leo XIII and Social Reform. Peter McKevitt (*ibid.*, May).

Ought Catholics to Defend the Inquisition? James Broderick (*Month*, Mar.-Apr.).

History and Church History. Geoffrey F. Nuttall (*Congregational Quarterly*, April).

A note on noncomformist church architecture. *Idem* (*ibid.*).

Jericho and the Date of the Exodus. William Ross (*Hibbert Journal*, April).

The North Wall of Jerusalem. E. A. Cerny, S.S. (*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, July).

Recent Biblical Archaeology [notes on agriculture and industry]. J. W. Jack (*Expository Times*, June).

Jewish Seafaring in Ancient Times. Raphael Patai (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, July).

Bombs over Bible Lands. Frederick Simpisch and W. Robert Moore (*National Geographic Magazine*, Aug.).

Gospel Chronology from Mary's Betrothal to the Birth of Christ (concluded). Paul Gaechter, S.J. (*Theological Studies*, Sept.).

The Influence of Romans XIII on Christian Political Thought. II. Augustine to Hincmar. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Peter and Paul. R. A. Knox (*Tablet*, June 28).

Quel che intravide Clemente VIII nella Confessione di San Pietro. Paolo Lionese (*Vita e Pensiero*, Jan.).

Classical and Biblical Scholarship in the Age of the Renaissance and Reformation. P. Lockwood and Roland H. Bainton (*Church History*, June).

The Struggle for Religious Liberty. Roland H. Bainton (*ibid.*).

Die frühchristlichen Basen und Kapetelle von S. Paolo fuori le Mura. Friedrich Wilhelm Deichman and Arnold Tschira (*Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*, 54, 1939, 1, 2).

A Roman Law of Egyptian Origin in the Passio SS. Perpetuae and Felicitatis. Johannes Quasten (*The Jurist*, July).

Military Service in the Infant Church. Louis J. Miller (*ibid.*).

Die Grundtöne im historischen Bild Kaiser Julians (361-363). Julius Wolf (*Stimmen der Zeit*, Apr.).

Das astronomische Ereignis 1940/41 und der Stern der Weisen. Gerhard Hartmann, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Die liturgischen Sprachen der katholischen Kirche. Wilhelm de Vries, S.J. (*Stimmen der Zeit*, Jan.).

Die Bedeutung der Frau für das frühe Christentum der Germanen. Karl Koch (*ibid.*).

A Classic in Hymnology [the *Splendor paternae gloriae*]. Romanus Rios, O.S.B. (*Clergy Review*, June).

Das mailandische Kirchenjahr in den Werken des hl. Ambrosius. Hieronymus Frank (*Pastor Bonus*, May and July, 1940).

Zur Lehre von der kirchlichen Busse in den ersten drei christlichen Jahrhunderten. Ignaz Baeckes (*ibid.*, May 1940).

History of Devotion to the Sacred Heart. Parts V and VI. M. Quinlan, S.J. (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, March and June).

San Valerio: Un asceta español del signo VII (ensayo crítico). Eduardo Bermejo García (*Boletín de la Universidad de Santiago*, Oct., 1940).

Le calendrier achéménide et ses précurseurs. H. Lewy (*Orientalia*, 1941).

The Medieval Tiarae of the Popes. G. Carr (*Ecclesiastical Review*, July).

The Origin and Significance of Feudalism. Carl Stepenson (*American Historical Review*, July).

Mediaeval Institutions in the Modern World, C. H. McIlwain (*Speculum*, July).

Carolingian Oaths of Fidelity. C. E. Odegaard (*ibid.*).

A List of the Norman Communes, 1189-1223. S. R. Packard (*ibid.*).

Johannes Sintrom de Herbipoli. Dorothy K. Coveney (*ibid.*).

The Maidenly Virtues of Chaucer's Virginia. Karl Young (*ibid.*).

Essai sur la formation de l'idée de croisade. Etienne Delaruelle (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, Jan. and Apr.).

The *Forma Scribendi* of Hugo Spechtshart [palaeography]. S. H. Steinberg (*Transactions of the Biblical Society*, Dec., 1940-Mar., 1941).

Ludwig Baur und die geschichtliche Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Philosophie: Ein Gedenkblatt zu seinem 70. Geburtstag. Martin Grabmann (*Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft*, 54, 1941, 2).

Spiritualité des *Exercices* et spiritualité de la Compagnie de Jésus. J. de Guibert (*Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, July-Dec., 1940).

Henri Suso et l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ. P. Debongnie (*ibid.*).

Aux sources de Vallgornera. M. Nepper et M. Viller (*ibid.*).

La solenne professione di S. Ignazio di Loiola e di cinque dei primi compagni in San Paolo fuori le Mura. Giuseppe Castellani, S.I. (*Archivum historicum societatis Iesu*, Jan.-June).

Génesis de los Ejercicios de S. Ignacio y su influjo en la fundación de la Compañía de Jesús (1521-1540). Pedro Leturia, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Le généralat de Claude Aquaviva (1581-1615), sa place dans l'histoire de la spiritualité de la Compagnie de Jésus. Joseph de Guibert, S.I. (*ibid.*).
Der apostolische Vikar Nikolaus Steno und die Jesuiten. Johannes Metzler, S.I. (*ibid.*).
Uppsala Domkyrka under 1700-1750. August Hahr and N. J. Soderberg (*Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift*, ed. by Gunnar Westin, Vol. XL, 1940).
Rimkrönikan om Linköpings biskopar. Hugo Norman (*ibid.*).
Blodbadet i Stockholm aar 1520. Olaf Kolsrud (*ibid.*).
Jöns Bengtsson (Oxenstierna), den vendiska hansan och 1457 års tronskifte. Salomon Kraft (*ibid.*).
Upphävandet av Nantesiska ediktet. Jean Hoffman (*ibid.*).
Michael Nostradamus. G. Houghton Brown (*Tablet*, July 5 and 12).
Personal Counselling in Early Protestantism. John T. McNeill (*Christendom*, Summer).
Pacifism and Civilization. Dwight J. Bradley (*ibid.*).
Sabbatarianism and the Decalogue. Lawrence L. McReavy (*Clergy Review*, June).
Church Union—the Roman Catholic Attitude. G. Francis S. Gray (*Chinese Recorder and Educational Review*, June).

EUROPEAN

Museo de América: Sus precursores en el siglo XVI. C. Bayle (*Razón y Fe*, June, 1941).
Una página de política española: Dictámenes de los Prelados in 1715. Federico Rodriguez Pomar (*ibid.*, May).
O Significado das comemoracões centenaries de Portugal. H. Branco Ramalhete (*Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, April).
Hugh, Son of Rory O'Donnell, 1607-1642 [in Belgium and Spain]. Brendan Jennings, O.F.M. (*Studies*, June).
Portugal: A Double Centenary. Thomas J. O'Donnell, S.J. (*ibid.*).
The End of a Jesuit Library [the confiscation and sale of the library of the Collège de Clermont or Collège Louis-le-Grand in Paris]. W. Kane, S.J. (*Mid-America*, July).
Clotilde di Savoia la Santa di Moncalieri. P. Ferraris, S.I. (*Civiltà cattolica*, Mar. 1, 1941).
Il "Credo" di F. Guicciardini. G. Rovella, S.J. (*ibid.*, Mar. 15).
Die Entstehung des Grauen Bundes, 1367-1424. Iso Müller (*Zeitschrift für schweizerische Geschichte*, 21, 1941, 2).
The Roman Question. F. Engel-Janosi (*Review of Politics*, July).
The Dollfuss Regime. Benjamin Blied (*Social Justice Review*, July-Aug.).
The Struggle for Power in Jugoslavia. Dinko Tomašiõ (*Journal of Central European Affairs*, July).
Italy within the Triple Alliance (1882-1915). Leo J. Wollemborg (*ibid.*).
Poland's Eastern Frontiers 981-1939. Oscar Halecki (*ibid.*).
Austria and the Beginning of the Kingdom of Greece. Frederick Engel-Janosi (*ibid.*).
The Case of Poland. Flavius (*Month*, May-June).
Pages from "Catholic Action" in Poland. Monsignor Joseph Gawlina (*Month*, Mar.-Apr.).

BRITISH EMPIRE

Ireland and Rome in the Eleventh Century. Aubrey Gwynn, S.J. (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Mar.).
The Irish Latin Hymns. Dean Mulcahy (*ibid.*, May).
Lanfranc and the Irish Church. Aubrey Gwynn, S.J. (*ibid.*, June).
Newman's Sermons: Anglican and Catholic. Michael Tynan (*ibid.*).
The Murder of Henry Clement [1235] and the Pirates of Lundy Island. F. M. Powicke (*History*, Mar.).
Early History of London Street-Lighting. E. S. de Beer (*ibid.*).

The Third Earl of March and Ulster [Edmund, 1351-1381], Church Builder at Bardfield and Taxted. Alfred Hills (*Essex Review*, Apr.).
Essex Lady who was a Queen's Favorite [Mary Tudor and Mistress Clarenceux] (*ibid.*).
Matthew Parker. Harold S. Darby (*London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, Jan.).
The Cromwellian Establishment. Ethyn W. Kirby (*Church History*, June)
John Hales and the Puritans during the Marian Exile. George T. Peck (*ibid.*).
Critical and Historical Notes on Blessed Margaret of Salisbury. Michael Derrick (*Month*, May-June).
Blessed Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury: A Fourth Centenary. Gordon Wheeler (*Tablet*, May 24).
Robert Southwell in London. The Jesuit Martyr in Tudor England. D. H. Moseley (*Commonweal*, Aug. 22).
The Centenary of St. Chad's [cathedral in Birmingham]. Denis Gwynn (*Clergy Review*, June).
Newmans Auffassung der Dogmenentwicklung. Ignaz Backes (*Pastor Bonus*, July, 1940).
Education and Gaelic Tradition in Ulster. D. Kennedy (*Studies*, June).

AMERICAN

The Accomplishments and Future Program of the Historical Records Survey Project. James H. Rodabaugh (*Ohio State Archaeolog. and Histor. Quart.*, July-Sept.).
The American Theme in Continental European Literatures. Carl Wittke (*Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.*, June).
The 'Ecology' of Middle Western Historians [historians reflect their regional environment in their writings]. John D. Hicks (*Wisconsin Mag. of Hist.*, June) .
Brownson, Hecker, and Hewit. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J. (*Catholic World*, July).
Race Relations in a New England Town [Milford, Massachusetts]. William G. O'Donnell (*New England Quart.*, June).
New England Artists in Italy. Madeleine B. Stern (*ibid.*).
The Religion of Geology [the religion of three geologists]. Conrad Wright (*ibid.*).
Fordham's Jesuit Beginnings. Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J. (*Thought*, Mar.).
The Pennsylvania Archives. Marvin W. Schlegel (*Pennsylvania Hist.*, July).
The A. H. Cassel Collection at Juniata College. Gerhard Friedrich (*American-German Rev.*, Aug.).
The Anglican Minority in Colonial Pennsylvania, with Particular Reference to the Indian. Frank J. Klingberg (*Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, July).
The Development of the Separation of the Church and State in the United States of America. John Joseph Graham (*Records of the Amer. Cath. Histor. Soc. of Philadelphia*, Mar.).
Catholicism in Colonial Maryland. Sister M. Rita, M.S.C. (*ibid.*).
Of Her Men and Wealth [France's Contribution to American Church Exemplified in Life of Fr. Deluol, St. Mary's Superior]. Anon. (*Voice*, June).
William Goddard's Victory for the Freedom of the Press. W. Bird Terwilliger (*Maryland Histor. Mag.*, June).
Control of the Baltimore Press during the Civil War. Sidney T. Matthews (*ibid.*).
Early Maryland Architecture. William Sener Rusk (*Americana*, April).
The Six Earliest Churches on the Eastern Shore of Virginia. G. C. Mason (*William and Mary College Quart.*, July).
Flora Macdonald in History. Dorothy Mackay Quynn (*North Carolina Histor. Rev.*, July).

Recruiting in Old Orleans for New Orleans. *Idem* (*American Histor. Rev.*, July).

Economic Conditions in the Confederacy as seen by the French Consuls. Gordon Wright (*Journal of Southern Hist.*, May).

Projected German Missionary Seminaries for America (concluded). John M. Lenhart, O.F.M.Cap. (*Social Justice Rev.*, June).

Reverend Simon Saenderl, C.SS.R., Indian Missionary. *Idem* (*ibid.*, July-Aug.).

A Page of Provincial History, St. John Baptist Province, Cincinnati. John B. Wuest, O.F.M. (*Provincial Chronicle*, Spring, 1941).

Two Obelisk Tombstones in Calvary Cemetery, Milwaukee [Father Huebner, S.J., d. 1849, and Father Beauprez, d. 1850]. Francis S. Betten, S.J. (*Salesianum*, July).

School Bus Transportation and Religious Liberty. Eustace F. Brennan (*ibid.*).

The School Law of 1853, Its Origin and Authors. Howard I. McKee (*Missouri Histor. Rev.*, July).

The French of Old Missouri (1804-1821): A Study of Assimilation. Harvey Wish (*Mid-America*, July).

The "De Soto Map". Barbara Boston (*ibid.*).

Missionary Work of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, in Oklahoma. Part III. Richard H. Harper (*Chronicles of Oklahoma*, June).

L'Enfance et la jeunesse de Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville. Guy Frégault (*Mid-America*, July).

L'Acadie et la Nouvelle-Angleterre, 1603-1763 (continued). Gustave Lanctot (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, July).

Prêtres séculiers et religieux qui ont exercé le saint ministère en Canada (1629-1679) [a list]. Ivanhoë Caron (*Bulletin des recherches historiques*, June, July, and Aug.).

L'établissement des Dominicains au Canada [from a letter of R. P. Rouleau of March, 1923] (*ibid.*, July).

Les criées dans les anciennes paroisses [a note from Patrice Lacombe, *La terre paternelle*, p. 39] (*ibid.*).

Joseph-Octave Plessis (suite). Ivanhoë Caron (*Canada Français*, June).

Canada, 1641-1941. Henry Somerville (*Studies*, June).

William James MacNeven: 1763-1841. Deasmumham O Raghallaigh (*ibid.*).

Contraband Trade between Louisiana and New Mexico in the Eighteenth Century. Henri Folmer (*New Mexico Histor. Rev.*, July).

The Government and the Navaho 1878-1883. Frank D. Reeve (*ibid.*).

Troublous Times in New Mexico 1659-1670 [concluded]. France V. Scholes (*ibid.*).

Hispaniola [Haiti]. John Gunther (*Foreign Affairs*, July).

The Church and the Political Situation in Chile. Clarence Finlayson (*Catholic World*, July).

Acculturation among the Brazilian Negroes. Arthur Ramos (*Journal of Negro Hist.*, Apr.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Ackerman, Edward A., *New England's Fishing Industry*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1941. Pp. xix, 303. $4.00.) The present volume by a member of the Department of Geography at Harvard University represents a careful study of the chief aspects of the fishing industry in New England. The book is provided with numerous illustrations and figures, a good index, and a reference list for further reading at the end of each chapter.

America's Peace Aims: A Committee Report. [The Catholic Association for International Peace]. (New York: Paulist Press. 1941. Pp. 48. $.10.)

Baker, George Claude, Jr., *An Introduction to the History of Early New England Methodism, 1789-1839*. (Durham: Duke University Press. 1941. Pp. vii, 145. $2.50.)

Barr, Mary-Margaret H., *Voltaire in America, 1744-1800*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1941. Pp. 150. $1.25.)

Boutwell, William Dow, et al., *America Prepares for Tomorrow: the Story of Our Total Defense Effort*. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1941. Pp. xv, 612. $2.65.) This volume discusses in thirty chapters the various phases of the present national defense effort. The six authors provide the volume with thirteen pertinent documents dealing with the subject of national defense, a number of charts and illustrations, a twenty-page bibliography, and an index.

Browne-Olf, Lillian, *Their Name is Pius*. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1941. Pp. xv, 382. $3.00.)

Church, William Farr, *Constitutional Thought in Sixteenth Century France: A Study in the Evolution of Ideas*. Volume XLVII of Harvard Historical Studies. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1941. Pp. 360. $3.75.)

Cooper, John M., *Temporal Sequence and the Marginal Cultures*. (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press. 1941. Pp. 69.)

Cunz, Dieter, *A History of the Germania Club*. (Baltimore: Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland. 1940. Pp. 27.)

Dale, Harrison Clifford, (Ed.), *The Ashley-Smith Explorations and the Discovery of a Central Route to the Pacific 1822-1829*. (Glendale, California: Arthur H. Clark Co. 1941. Pp. 360. $6.00.)

Directory of Churches in New Jersey, Warren County. (Newark: Historical Records Survey. 1941. Pp. 24. Mimeographed.)

Directory of Churches, Missions, and Religious Institutions of Tennessee, Shelby County. (Nashville: Tennessee Historical Records Survey Project. 1941. Pp. 114. Mimeographed.)

Dyer, John, *Grongar Hill*, edited with Introduction and Notes by Richard C. Boys. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1941. Pp. xi, 114. $1.75.) Mr. Boys of the University of Michigan here presents a critical edition of the poem first published in 1726 by the Welsh poet, John Dyer.

The editor's notes and critical apparatus will be a welcome contribution to students of eighteenth-century English literature.

Ferrero, Guglielmo, *The Reconstruction of Europe. Talleyrand and the Congress of Vienna, 1814-1815.* Trans. by Theodore R. Jaeckel. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1941. Pp. xv, 351. $3.50.)

Gerow, R. O., *Cradle Days of St. Mary's at Natchez.* (Natchez, Miss.: Hope Haven Press. 1941. Pp. xiii, 302.)

Gilbert, Dan, *The Mind of Christ.* (Printed by the Author. 1941. Pp. 158. $1.00.)

Griffin, Grace Gardner, and Dorothy M. Louraine, *Writings on American History 1936: A Bibliography of Books and Articles on United States History Published during the Year 1936.* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1941. Pp. xxviii, 486. $1.25.)

Haiman, Miecislaus, *Polish Pioneers of Pennsylvania.* [Annals of the Polish Roman Catholic Union Archives and Museum. Vol. VI.] (Chicago: Polish R. C. Union of America. 1941. Pp. 72.) This most recent publication of the Polish Catholic Union contains a series of brief biographical sketches of early Polish settlers in Pennsylvania, a bibliography of five pages, and a list of the members of the Polish Society of History and Museum of America as of June 1, 1941.

Huth, Hans, *Observations concerning the Conservation of Monuments in Europe and America.* (Washington: National Park Service. 1940. Pp. 64. Lithoprinted.)

Inventory of the Church Archives of New Jersey, Congregational Christian Churches [Prepared by the New Jersey Historical Records Survey Program.] (Newark: Historical Records Survey. 1941. Pp. 94. Lithoprinted.)

Johnson, Peter Leo and John G. Lavies, *Early Catholic Church Property in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.* (Milwaukee: Printed by the Author. 1941. Pp. 82.)

The Renaissance of Asia. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1941. Pp. xi, 169. $1.50.) This slender volume contains the six lectures delivered under the auspices of the Committee on International Relations of the University of California at Los Angeles in 1939. The six lecturers were all drawn from the faculties of the two branches of the University of California. One lecture deals with India, a second with Indo-China, two with Japanese foreign policy, one with Soviet Russia in Asia, and the final lecture is on "The Future of China."

Lanctot, Gustave, (Ed.), *Les Canadiens français et leurs voisins du sud.* (Toronto: Ryerson Press. 1941. Pp. 322. $3.00.)

Linebarger, Paul, M.A., *The China of Chiang K'ai-Shek: A Political Study.* (Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1941. Pp. xi, 449. $2.50 Cloth; $1.00 Paper.) This volume by Dr. Linebarger of Duke University is a thorough and documented study of the political aspects of China's history under the present generalissimo. The author's long residence in the Far East, and his careful use of sources make it about as near to an authentic account as one could ask at this time. The text runs to 281 pages, and an additional 140 pages give a very useful collection of documents and materials for study. The volume also contains a glossary of Chinese terms and a satisfactory index.

Miller, Hugh, *Christian Truth in History.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1941. Pp. xvii, 236. $2.50.)